Contracts Expiring set for Commission Review

For the Month of

August, 2025 (August 6, 2025)

Vendor	Contract Description	Contract Value /	Revenue	Net	Contract	Contract Deadline to	Due Date for Commission
		Budgeted Estimate		Revenue / (Cost)	Expiration	Expiration Cancel/Renew	Review (90 Days Prior to
					Date	Contract	Expiration)
B.P. Academy, Inc.	Facility Use Agreement	00.0\$	\$4,353.00	\$4,353.00	9/30/2025	8/31/2025	7/2/2025

Original Terms: Initial term of one (1) year with additional terms thereafter.

Current Period: Second Renewal (10/01/2024 - 09/30/2025) New Period: Third Renewal (10/01/2025 - 09/30/2026)

Type of Contract: Revenue

Performance: C

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: BP Academy is currently compliant with some of the requirements of the FUA. Some financial documents have not been turned in. The organization is not compliant with the residency repeatment and the facility use agreement. BP is at a 42% residency rate which is well below the 65% requirement.

Notes:

7/2/2025 8/31/2025 \$11,595.00 9/30/2025 \$11,595.00 Facility Use Agreement Elite Optimist of Central Pembroke Pines, Inc.

Original Terms: Initial period with additional terms upon mutual consent Current Period: Original Agreement (02/18/2025 - 09/30/2025)

New Period: First Renewal (10/01/2025 - 09/30/2026)

Type of Contract: Revenue

Performance: B

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: Elite Optimist of Central Pines (EOCP) consistently demonstrates professionalism and reliability. The organization is exceptionally responsive to requiests for required information, ensuring clear and timely communication EOCP consistently submits all required rosters and payments on time, reflecting a strong commitment to compliance and organizational excellence.

Notes:

Commerce, Inc.

9/1/2025 10/31/2025 (\$24,000.00) 11/30/2025 \$0.00 \$24,000.00 Partnership Agreement Miramar-Pembroke Pines Regional Chamber of

Current Period: Eighth Renewal (12/01/2024 - 11/30/2025) New Period: Ninth Renewal (12/01/2025 - 11/30/2026)

Original Terms: Initial term of one (1) year with additional, one (1) year terms thereafter.

Type of Contract: Expense

Performance: A

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: The Miramar Pembroke Pines Regional Chamber of Commerce provides excellent service to the business community through education, pragamming and events. The Chamber fullfills the terms of our agreement and works with City staff well.

Notes:

Vendor	Contract Description	Contract Value /	Revenue	Net	Contract	Contract Deadline to	Due Date for Commission
		Budgeted Estimate		Revenue / (Cost)	Expiration) Expiration Cancel/Renew	Review (90 Days Prior to
					Date	Contract	Expiration)
Optimist Club of Pembroke Facility Use Agreement	Facility Use Agreement	00.0\$	318,846.00	\$18,846.00	\$18,846.00 9/30/2025	8/31/2025	7/2/2025
Lakes, Florida, Inc.							

Original Terms: Initial period with additional, one (1) year terms thereafter.

Current Period: Eighth Renewal (10/01/2024-09/30/2025)

New Period: Ninth Renewal (10/01/2025-09/30/2026)

Type of Contract: Revenue

Performance: B

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: Pembroke Lakes Optimist has improved their compliance with Financial Documentation and submitting required paperwork. Rosters were turned in on time.

8/31/2025 9/30/2025 Original Terms: Initial term of one (1) year with additional, one (1) year terms thereafter \$39,273.00 \$39,273.00 Facility Use Agreement Optimist Club of West Pembroke Pines, Inc.

Current Period: Eighth Renewal (10/01/2024 - 09/30/2025)

New Period: Ninth Renewal (10/01/2025 - 09/30/2026)

Type of Contract: Revenue

Performance: A

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: The Optimist Club of West Pembroke Pines is currently compliant with the Facility use Agreement. WPPO is responsive with requested paperwork and payments WPPO continues to lead the way with scheduling games and practices.

Pembroke Pines Optimist	Facility Use Agreement	\$0.00	\$22,190.00	\$22,190.00	9/30/2025	8/31/2025	7/2/2025
Club, Inc.							
	Original Terms: Initial period with	n additional or) year terms ther	eafter			

Current Period: Eighth Renewal (10/01/2024-09/30/2025)

New Period: Ninth Renewal (10/01/2025-09/30/2026)

Type of Contract: Revenue

Performance: A

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: Pembroke Pines Optimist is currently compliant in all aspects of the Facility Use Agreement. PPO is at the forefront of compliance for all our our Facility Use Agreements. PPO is consistan with on time delivery of all paperwork and payments.

TargetSolutions Learning,	Software Platform for RMS, Scheduling, and	\$60,086.34	\$0.00	(\$60,086.34)	9/30/2025	8/31/2025	7/2/2025
LLC. d/b/a Vector Solutions	Online Training						

New Period: Fourth Renewal (10/01/2025 - 09/30/2026) Current Period: Third Renewal (10/01/2024 - 09/30/2025)

Original Terms: Initial term of three (3) year period with additional, one (1) year terms thereafter.

Type of Contract: Expense

Performance: A

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: The Fire Department is satisfied with the software and service provided. We are considering addint modules to assist with tracking of various supplies.

Notes:

Vendor	Contract Description	Contract Value / Budgeted Estimate	Revenue	Net Revenue / (Cost)	Contract Expiration Date	Deadline to Cancel/Renew Contract	Due Date for Commission Review (90 Days Prior to Expiration)
Tropical Touch Gardens	RE-23-03 Parks Tree Trimming Services	\$96,770.00	00.0\$	(\$96,770.00) 11/8/2025	11/8/2025	10/9/2025	8/10/2025
Center, Inc.	Original Terms: Initial two Current Period: Original / New Period: First Ren Type of Contract: Expense Performance: A Recommend for Renewal: Yes	Original Terms: Initial two (2) year period with two (2) additional one (1) year terms Current Period: Original Agreement (11/09/2023 - 11/08/2025) New Period: First Renewal (11/09/2025 - 11/08/2026) App of Contract: Expense Performance: A ind for Renewal: Yes	od with two (2) additiona 1/09/2023 - 11/08/2025) 2025 - 11/08/2026)	il one (1) year terms			
Department Comments:	Department Comments: Very Communicative and highly knowledgable						
	čo:						
West Pines Girlf Softball, Inc. Facility Use Agreement		\$0.00	\$13,118.00	\$13,118.00	9/30/2025	8/31/2025	7/2/2025
	Original I em Current Perio New Perio	Original Terms: Initial period with additional one (1) year terms thereafter Current Period: Eighth Renewal (10/01/2024-09/30/2025) New Period: Ninth Renewal (10/01/2025-09/30/2026)	ilonal one (1) year terms 1/2024-09/30/2025) '2025-09/30/2026)	merealter			
	Type of Contract: Revenue Performance: C	ct: Revenue ce: C					
Department Commen	Recommend for Renewal: Yes West Pines Girlf Softball is currently not compliant with some areas of the Facility Use Agreement. Notice of Public Meetings have not been turned in. Required financial end of year Department Comments: paperwork have not been turned in. Rosters and invoices have been processed. Communication with the executive board has been inconsistent throughout the year. Leadership chathin chis club are warranted.	Renewal: Yes npliant with some areas of the Fe and invoices have been process	rcility Use Agreement. Nosed. Communication with	otice of Public Meetin I the executive board	gs have not be has been incor	en turned in. Requ	Renewal: Yes reliance areas of the Facility Use Agreement. Notice of Public Meetings have not been turned in. Required financial end of year and invoices have been processed. Communication with the executive board has been inconsistent throughout the year. Leadership changes in

6/26/2025 8/25/2025 ง 2 259,680.00) 9/24/2025
Original Terms: Initial term of one (1) year with additional terms thereafter.
Current Period: Original Agreement (09/25/2024 - 09/24/2025)
New Period: First Renewal (09/25/2025 - 09/24/2028) ZeroEyes SaaS License ZeroEyes, Inc.

Notes:

Type of Contract: Expense

Performance: A

Recommend for Renewal: Yes

Department Comments: Recommende contract for 3-year period. This renewal will only be for AV campus.

Notes:

Vendor Name:	BP Academy, Inc.	
Contract Purpose:	Facility Use Agreement for the use certical fields and buildings for recreational personal pe	
		Department
Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Property Maintenance.	25	20
2. Payment Performance.	30	24
3. Are all requirements of the lease being met?	25	16
4. Department overall satisfaction.	20	14
	100	74
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?	▼ Yes / □ No / □ Not	Applicable
Department Comments:	BP Academy is currently compliant withe requirements of the FUA. Some findocuments have not been turned in. Torganization is not compliant with the requirement in the facility use agreem 42% Residency rate which is well belo requirement.	nancial he residency ent. BP is at a
Department Representative (Signature)	Jonathan Nasser Division Dir of Recre Name & Title	eation Date
What had a		
Department Head Approval (Signature)	Christina Goulding Department D	Director Date

V 1 N	FILE OF CONTRACTOR OF THE PLANTS OF THE PLAN	
Vendor Name:	Elite Optimist of Central Pines	
Contract Purpose:	FUA - Pasadena Park	
	14	Department
Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Property Maintenance.	25	20
2. Payment Performance.	30	25
3. Are all requirements of the lease being met?	25	20
4. Department overall satisfaction.	20	17
	100	82
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80	
	C = 79 - 70	
	D = 69 - 60	
	F = 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?	₩ Yes / □ No / □ Not/	Applicable
Department Comments:	Elite Optimist of Central Pines (EOCP)	consistently
Department Comments.	demonstrates professionalism and rel	
	organization is exceptionally responsi	
	for required information, ensuring clear communication. EOCP consistently su	
	required rosters and payments on time	
	strong commitment to compliance and	
	organizational excellence.	
1/2		
	Jonathan Nasser Division Dir. of Re	ecreation
Department Representative (Signature)	Name & Title	Date
(Method Dulden	Christina Goulding Department D	irector
	Christina Goliding Department D	

Vendor Name:	Miramar-Pembroke Pines Regional Ch Commerce, Inc.	namber of
Contract Purpose:	Partnership Agreement	
Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Service(s) Completed on time	25	24
2. Quality of Service(s)	30	28
3. Are all requirements of the contract being	met 25	23
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	20
	100	95
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0 Yes / No / Not The Miramar Pembroke Pines Regional Commerce provides excellent service business community through educating programing and events. The Chambet terms of our agreement and works with well.	to the uon, r fulfills the
Department Representative (Signature)	Joseph Yaciuk, AICP, Assistant Director Planning and Economic Development Name & Title	7/23/2025 Date
Department Head Approval (Signature)	Michael Stamm Jr, Assistant City Manager/ Director Planning and Economic Development Name & Title	7/23/2025 Date
Department Treat Approval (Signature)	INATITE OF TITLE	Date

Vendor Name:	Optimist Club of Pembroke Lakes, Florida, Inc.
Contract Purpose:	Facility Use Agreement for the use certain athletic fields and buildings for recreational purposes
	Department Maximum Head
Rating Categories	Points Rating
1. Property Maintenance.	25
2. Payment Performance.	30 19
3. Are all requirements of the lease being met?	25 20
4. Department overall satisfaction.	20 19
	100 82
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0
Recommend Renewal?	▼ Yes / □ No / □ Not Applicable
Department Comments:	Pembroke Lakes Optimist has improved their compliance with Financial Documentation and submitting required paperwork. Rosters were turned in on time.
M M	I lead the Alexandria Division
Department Representative (Signature)	/ Jonathan Nasser Division Dir of Recreation Name & Title Date
September 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	
000	/ Christina Goulding Department Director Name & Title Date

Vendor Name:	Optimist Club of West Pembroke Pine	s, Inc.
Contract Purpose:	Facility Use Agreement for the use ce fields and buildings for recreational p	
Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Property Maintenance.	25	24
2. Payment Performance.	30	28
3. Are all requirements of the lease being met?	25	23
4. Department overall satisfaction.	20	19
	100	94
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?	₩ Yes / □ No / □ Not	Applicable
Department Comments:	The Optimist Club of West Pembroke currently compliant with the Facility U Agreement. WPPO is responsive with paperwork and payments. WPPO contine way with schedulng games and pr	se requested inues to lead
Department Representative (Signature)	Jonathan Nasser Division Dir of Roname & Title	ecreation Date
(Method Bulling	Christina Goulding Department I	
Department Head Approval (Signature)	Name & Title	Date

Vendor Name:	Pembroke Pines Optimist Club, Inc.
Contract Purpose:	Facility Use Agreement for the use certain athletic fields and buildings for recreational purposes
Rating Categories	Department Maximum Head Points Rating
1. Property Maintenance.	25 <u>24</u>
2. Payment Performance.	30 29
3. Are all requirements of the lease being met?	25
4. Department overall satisfaction.	20 19
	100 96
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0
Recommend Renewal?	₩ Yes / □ No / □ Not Applicable
Department Comments:	Pembroke Pines Optimist is currently compliant in all aspects of the Facility Use Agreement. PPO is at the forefront of compliance for all of our Facility Use Agreements. PPO is consisant with on time delivery of all paperwork and payments.
0	
Department Representative (Signature)	Jonathan Nasser Division Dir. of Recreation Name & Title Date
Department Mead Approval (Signature)	Christina Goulding Department Director Name & Title Date

Vendor Name:	TargetSolutions Learning, LLC. d/b/a Vector Solutions
Contract Purpose:	RMS, Scheduling, and Online Training
Rating Categories	Department Maximum Head <u>Points Rating</u>
1. Software support meets expectations	25 23
2. Adaptability of Software	25
3. Are all requirements of the contract being	met 25 25
4. Department overall satisfaction	25 24
	100 94
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0 Yes / □ No / □ Not Applicable The fire department is satisfied with the software and service provided. We are considering adding modules to assit with tracking of various supplies.
Department Representative (Signature) Muscellia Kaulusus Department Head Approva (Signature)	Name & Title Date March Podriguez ft 3/31/25 Name & Title Date

Rating Categories 1. Work Completed on time 2. Quality of Work 3. Are all requirements of the contract being met 4. Department overall satisfaction Recommend Renewal?	3 Parks Tree Trimming Service Maximum Points 25 30	Department Head Rating
1. Work Completed on time 2. Quality of Work 3. Are all requirements of the contract being met 4. Department overall satisfaction Recommend Renewal?	Points 25	Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time 2. Quality of Work 3. Are all requirements of the contract being met 4. Department overall satisfaction Recommend Renewal?	25	
2. Quality of Work 3. Are all requirements of the contract being met 4. Department overall satisfaction Recommend Renewal?		24
3. Are all requirements of the contract being met 4. Department overall satisfaction Recommend Renewal?	30	
4. Department overall satisfaction Recommend Renewal?		30
Recommend Renewal?	25	25
	20	20
	100	99
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0	
Department Comments:	□ Yes /□	No / Not Applicable
	mmunicative and highly knowle	edgable.
1 M Cock	Meagan Cook Division D	Director of Park Operations 7/10/2025
Department Representative (Signature) Name &	Title I	Date
Department Head Approval (Signature) Name &		f Parks, Recreation and Cultural Arts 7/10/2025 Date
Department Representative Signature) Name &		

Vendor Name:	West Pines Girls Softball, Inc.	
Contract Purpose:	Facility Use Agreement for the use cer fields and buildings for recreational pr	
Rating Categories	Maximum Points	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Property Maintenance.	25	22
	30	24
2. Payment Performance.		
3. Are all requirements of the lease being met?	25	14
4. Department overall satisfaction.	20	10
	100	70
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0	Ši)
Recommend Renewal?	₩ Yes / □ No / □ Not	Applicable
Department Comments:	West Pines Girls Softball is currently i	not compliant
	with some areas of the Facility Use Ag Notice of Public Meetings have not be Required financial end of year paperw been turned in. Rosters and invoices in processed. Communication with the e board has been inconsistent throughout Leadership changes in this club are w	reement. en turned in. ork have not have been xecutive but the year.
	Notice of Public Meetings have not be Required financial end of year paperw been turned in. Rosters and invoices I processed. Communication with the e board has been inconsistent through Leadership changes in this club are w	preement. en turned in. en turned in. eork have not have been ecutive out the year. earranted.
Department Representative (Signature)	Notice of Public Meetings have not be Required financial end of year paperw been turned in. Rosters and invoices I processed. Communication with the e board has been inconsistent througho	preement. en turned in. en turned in. eork have not have been eccutive but the year. earranted.
Department Representative (Signature) Department Head Approval (Signature)	Notice of Public Meetings have not be Required financial end of year paperw been turned in. Rosters and invoices I processed. Communication with the e board has been inconsistent throughout Leadership changes in this club are w	preement. en turned in. ork have not have been executive out the year. earranted.

Vendor Name:	ZeroEyes	
Contract Purpose:	ZeroEyes weapons detection system for PPCS	
Rating Categories	D Maximum <u>Points</u>	epartment Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25	25
2. Quality of Work	30	30
3. Are all requirements of the contract being	met 25	25
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	20
	100	100
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?	№ Yes / □ No / □ Not Applicable	
Department Comments:	Recommend contract renewal for 3yr period.	
	This renewal will only be for AV campus.	
Department Representative (Signature)	Name & Title	Date
2 sparament representative (eightature)	Name & Title	Date

Vendor Name:	ABS General (Contractors		
Contract Purpose:	Home Repair	Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		15
2. Quality of Work		30		28
3. Are all requirements of the contract b	peing met	25		20
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		17
	=	100		80
	B	. = : = : = : =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		Not App	licable	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	This evaluation inspectors, Cit Overall, the quand consistent points were deto delays in me	n is based on by staff, and t ality of work t with progra educted in the	n feedback f he housing has been s m standard e final asse	consultant. satisfactory ls. However, ssment due
	inspectors, Cit Overall, the quand consistent points were de to delays in me	n is based on by staff, and to lality of work to with progra educted in the eeting project	he housing has been s m standard e final asset timelines.	consultant. eatisfactory ls. However, ssment due
	inspectors, Cit Overall, the quand consistent points were de to delays in me	n is based on by staff, and to ality of work t with progra educted in the eeting projec	he housing has been s m standard e final asset timelines.	consultant. eatisfactory ls. However, ssment due

Title

Department Head Approval

Vendor Name:	Brunt & Company, Inc.
Contract Purpose:	Home Repair Projects

Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25	15
2. Quality of Work	30	25
3. Are all requirements of the contract being met	25	15
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	15
	100	70

A = B = C = D =	100 - 90
B =	89 - 80
C =	79 - 70
D = .	69 - 60
F =	59 - 0

Recommend Renewal?

Not Applicable

Department Comments:

This evaluation is based on feedback from program inspectors, City staff, and the housing consultant. While some aspects of the work met program requirements, areas of concern were noted throughout the project, particularly related to timeliness, coordination, and responsiveness. These factors contributed to a lower overall performance rating.

Department Representative

Department Head Approval

Title

Title

Vendor Name:	Built Solid Constructi	on, LLC.	
Contract Purpose:	Home Repair Projects		
Rating Categories	Maxim <u>Point</u>	um	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25		N/A
2. Quality of Work	30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract	peing met 25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction	20		N/A
	100		N/A
	A = B = C = D = F =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
		00 0	
Recommend Renewal?	No	t Applicable	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	This contractor attend not selected for award responsive bidder. No the rating period.	t Applicable ed pre-bid meeting I, as they were not	the lowest
_	This contractor attend not selected for award responsive bidder. No	t Applicable ed pre-bid meeting I, as they were not	the lowest
Department Comments:	This contractor attend not selected for award responsive bidder. No the rating period.	t Applicable ed pre-bid meeting I, as they were not	the lowest
_	This contractor attend not selected for award responsive bidder. No the rating period.	ed pre-bid meeting l, as they were not contract was issue	the lowest

Vendor Name:	Dan Enterp	orises Team, LL	C.	
Contract Purpose:	Home Rep	air Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		0
2. Quality of Work		30		0
3. Are all requirements of the contract	being met	25		0
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		0
		100		N/A
		A = B = C = D = F =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?	A DESTRUCTION	Not App	licable	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:		ctor's agreemer	nt was termi	
	conveniend this period	ctor's agreemer	nt was termi rating is app	olicable for

Vendor Name:	Dixie Const	truction, Inc.		
	_			
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	ir Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		N/A
2. Quality of Work		30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract t	peing met	25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		N/A
		100	- 5	N/A
		A =	100 - 90	
		B = C =	89 - 80 79 - 70	
		D =	69 - 60	
		F =	59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		_	59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	contract. So observed re project coo early stages	F =	59 - 0 clicable ly awarded enges have al communic e project is ficient perfo	been cation and still in its
	contract. So observed re project coo early stages to provide a	Not App ctor was recent ome initial chall garding genera rdination. As the s, there is insuff a rating at this to	olicable ly awarded enges have al communic e project is ficient perfo	been cation and still in its ormance data
	contract. So observed re project coo early stages to provide a	Not Appeted with the second se	olicable ly awarded enges have al communic e project is ficient perfo	been cation and still in its ormance data

Vendor Name:	DMS Contractors, LLC

Home Repair Projects Contract Purpose:

Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25	18
2. Quality of Work	30	20
3. Are all requirements of the contract being met	25	18
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	15
	100	71

A =	100 - 90
B =	89 - 80
C =	79 - 70
D =	69 - 60
F=	59 - 0

Recommend Renewal?

Not Applicable

Department Comments:

This evaluation is based on feedback from program inspectors, City staff, and the housing consultant. While some aspects of the work met program requirements, areas of concern were noted throughout the project, particularly related to timeliness, coordination, and responsiveness. These factors contributed to a lower overall performance rating.

Department Representative

Department Head Approval

Assistant Director
Title
ACM/DIRECTOR

Vendor Name:	DSW Home	s, LLC.		
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	ir Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum Points		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		N/A
2. Quality of Work		30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract to	peing met	25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		N/A
		100		N/A
		A = B = C = D = F =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		Not Apr	licable	
		Постър		
Department Comments:	not selected	ctor attended p I for award, as bidder. No cont	they were n	ot the lowest
Department Comments:	not selected responsive the rating p	ctor attended p I for award, as bidder. No cont eriod.	they were n	ot the lowest sued during
Department Comments: Department Representative	not selected responsive the rating p	ctor attended p I for award, as bidder. No cont	they were n	ot the lowest sued during

Vendor Name:	Encop, Inc	·.		
Contract Purpose:	Home Rep	air Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		N/A
2. Quality of Work		30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract	being met	25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		N/A
		100		N/A
		A = B = C =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70	
		D = F =	69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?			59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	not selecte	Not Apparent of the Apparent o	59 - 0 clicable re-bid meet they were n	ot the lowest

Vendor Name:	Hoggins Co	onstruction Unl	imited, LLC	
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	air Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		N/A
2. Quality of Work		30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract	being met	25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		N/A
		100		N/A
		A = B = C = D = F =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		Not App	olicable	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	not selected	ctor attended p d for award, as bidder. No con	re-bid meet they were n	ot the lowest
	not selected responsive the rating p	ctor attended p d for award, as bidder. No con eriod.	re-bid meeti they were n tract was is:	ot the lowest sued during
	not selected responsive the rating p	ctor attended p d for award, as bidder. No con	re-bid meeti they were n tract was is:	ot the lowest sued during

	1		0	
Vendor Name:	James Joye	ce Construction	Corp.	
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	ir Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		15
2. Quality of Work		30		28
3. Are all requirements of the contract l	being met	25		20
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		17
		100		80
		A = B = C =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70	
		D = F =	69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		D =	69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	inspectors, Overall, the and consist points were	D = F =	69 - 60 59 - 0 blicable feedback the housing has been s m standard e final asse	consultant. satisfactory ds. However, essment due
	inspectors, Overall, the and consist points were to delays in	D = F = Not App tion is based or City staff, and to quality of work tent with progra e deducted in the meeting project	69 - 60 59 - 0 slicable n feedback the housing thas been sum standard e final asse	g consultant. satisfactory ds. However, essment due
	inspectors, Overall, the and consist points were to delays in	D = F = Not App tion is based or City staff, and to quality of work tent with progra	69 - 60 59 - 0 slicable n feedback the housing thas been sum standard e final asse	y consultant. satisfactory ds. However, essment due

Vendor Name:	Leonard Gr	anam DBA LGI	Construction	on
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	ir Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		N/A
2. Quality of Work		30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract to	peing met	25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		N/A
		100		N/A
		A = B = C = D = F =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		Not App	licable	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	not selected	ctor attended p I for award, as bidder. No con	re-bid meet they were n	ot the lowest
Department Comments:	not selected responsive the rating po	ctor attended p I for award, as bidder. No cont eriod.	re-bid meet they were n tract was is	ot the lowest
	not selected responsive the rating po	ctor attended p I for award, as bidder. No con	re-bid meet they were n tract was is	ot the lowest

eral Contractor, LLC.

Contract Purpose: Home Repair Projects

Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25	15
2. Quality of Work	30	25
3. Are all requirements of the contract being met	25	15
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	15
	100	70

A = B = C = D =	100 - 90
B =	89 - 80
C =	79 - 70
D =	69 - 60
F =	59 - 0

Recommend Renewal?

Not Applicable

Department Comments:

This evaluation is based on feedback from program inspectors, City staff, and the housing consultant. While some aspects of the work met program requirements, areas of concern were noted throughout the project, particularly related to timeliness, coordination, and responsiveness. These factors contributed to a lower overall performance rating.

Department Representative

Department Head Approval

Title

Title

Vendor Name:	Metro Contractor Incorporated
Contract Purpose:	Home Repair Projects

Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25	15
2. Quality of Work	30	25
3. Are all requirements of the contract being met	25	20
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	15
	100	75

A = B =	100 - 90
B =	89 - 80
C =	79 - 70
D =	69 - 60
F=	59 - 0

Recommend Renewal?

Not Applicable

Department Comments:

This evaluation is based on feedback from program inspectors, City staff, and the housing consultant. While some aspects of the work met program requirements, areas of concern were noted throughout the project, particularly related to timeliness, coordination, and responsiveness. These factors contributed to a lower overall performance rating.

Department Representative

Department Head Approval

Title

Title

Vendor Name:	R&B Remo	deling, Inc.		
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	ir Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		21
2. Quality of Work		30		30
3. Are all requirements of the contract	being met	25		21
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		20
		100		92
		A = B =	100 - 90 89 - 80	
		C = D = F =	79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		D =	69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	inspectors, Overall, the and consist points were	D = F =	69 - 60 59 - 0 licable feedback he housing has been s m standard e final asse	y consultant. satisfactory ds. However, essment due

Vendor Name:	Stacy Bomar Construction, LLC.
Contract Purpose:	Home Repair Projects

Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25	20
2. Quality of Work	30	28
3. Are all requirements of the contract being met	25	20
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	15
	100	83

A =	100 - 90
B =	89 - 80
C =	79 - 70
D =	69 - 60
F=	59 - 0

Recommend Renewal?

Not Applicable

Department Comments:

This evaluation is based on feedback from program inspectors, City staff, and the housing consultant. Overall, the quality of work has been satisfactory and consistent with program standards. However, points were deducted in the final assessment due to delays in meeting project timelines.

Department Representative

Department Head Approval

Title

1) DIRECTOR

Titl

Vendor Name:	Supreme Roofing and	Construction	
Contract Purpose:	Home Repair Projects		
Rating Categories	Maximu <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time	25		N/A
2. Quality of Work	30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract I	peing met 25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction	20		N/A
	100		N/A
	A = B = C = D = F =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?	Not	Applicable	
Department Comments:	This contractor did not during the rating period considered for contract	and therefore	
Department Representative Department Head Approval	Assistant Title ACM D	Directo	

Vendor Name:	Sustainable	Design		
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	ir Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		N/A
2. Quality of Work		30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract b	peing met	25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		N/A
		100		N/A
		A = B = C = D = F =	100 - 90 89 - 80 79 - 70 69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		Not App	licable	
Department Comments:	not selected	ctor attended p		
	the rating po	bidder. No cont		

Vendor Name:	Top Crafts,	Inc.		
Contract Purpose:	Home Repa	ir Projects		
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Work Completed on time		25		N/A
2. Quality of Work		30		N/A
3. Are all requirements of the contract b	eing met	25		N/A
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		N/A
		100		N/A
		A =	100 - 90	
		B = C =	89 - 80 79 - 70	
		D = F =	69 - 60 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?		Not App	licable	
Department Comments:	not submit rating perio	ctor attended pr a bid for any so d. As no propos e could be eval	licitations of sals were re	during the
MIZ	Assis	fant D	recto	
Department Representative	ASS S	fant D.	recto	

Vendor Name:	Choices for Life, Inc.	
Contract Purpose:	Commercial Lease of City building.	
	Depart	
Rating Categories	Maximum Hea <u>Points</u> <u>Rati</u>	
1. Property Maintenance.	25 25	5
2. Payment Performance.	30 30)
3. Are all requirements of the lease being met?	25 20)
4. Department overall satisfaction.	20 15	5
	100 90)
	A = 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 F = 59 - 0	
Recommend Renewal?	☐ Yes / ☐ No / ■ Not Applicate	ole
Department Comments:	Choices for Life, Inc. leases the premises local 6700 NW 13 St., Pembroke Pines, FL 33025. Leesee has made payments consistent on time throughout the lease agreement. They however sometimes use areas of the building not part of the lease agreement.	ly and
12/1		
	D' ' D' CD C' A/C	1/25
Donatmont Donrogentative (Cianalista)	Jonathan Nasser Division Dir of Recreation 4/9	JIZU
Department Representative (Signature)	Name & Title Christina Sorensen Department Director 4/9/	

Community Redevelopment Associates of Florida,

PL-20-01 Grant Administration for Community

Redevelopment Projects

Vendor Name:

Contract Purpose:

Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Service(s) Completed on time		25		23
2. Quality of Service(s)		30		25
3. Are all requirements of the contract being	met	25		25
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		17
		100	_	90
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:	☐ Yes	A = B = C = D = F = No ntinues to wor		Applicable
	efficiencies program. T over 50 res The city is a	within the suc he city current idents to partii also working w of the Purchas	ccessful Hom tly has a wai cipate in the vith CRAFLA	ne repair ting list of program. to raise
Department Representative (Signature) Department Head Approval (Signature)	Name & Title Name & Title	HLLSTAN	nu, Hen	restor 6// Date 1/ WIRTHO Date

Vendor Name:	Miami Art	Services, LLC		
Contract Purpose:	Art Handlin	ng Services for	the Frank A	rt Gallery
				Department
Rating Categories		Maximum <u>Points</u>		Head Rating
1. Service(s) Completed on time		25		24
2. Quality of Service(s)		30		29
3. Are all requirements of the contract being	met	25		25
4. Department overall satisfaction		20		19
		100	-	97
		A =	100 - 90	
		B = C =	89 - 80 79 - 70	
		D = F =	69 - 60 59 - 0	
		L.		
Recommend Renewal?	☐ Ye	s / 🗆 No	/ ■ Not	Applicable
Department Comments:		Services LLC ha		
	Gallery sin	ce 2019. Since 2	2024, we ha	ve engaged
		dependent art h nese same servi		
	City.			
n = n				
11. //				
Barrel and and I was a second	Name 9 Till			Dete
Department Representative (Signature)	Name & Titl	e va Sutensian)	ADIA	Date

Vendor Name: RS Photography, LLC. D/B/A TSS **Photography Photography Services for Recreational Contract Purpose:** Soccer Programs twice a year Department Head Maximum Rating Categories Rating <u>Points</u> 1. Service(s) Completed on time 25 25 2. Quality of Service(s) 30 30 3. Are all requirements of the contract being met 25 25 4. Department overall satisfaction 20 20 100 100 100 - 90 B = 89 - 80 C = 79 - 70 D = 69 - 60 59 - 0 F = **Recommend Renewal?** Yes / □ No Not Applicable **Department Comments:** Excellent company and always on time for the photo shoots and provided great service to our participants. Payments per the contract are always turned in on a timely manner. / Jonathan Nasser Division Dir of Rec 7/7/2025 Department Représentative (Signature) Date Name & Title / Christina Sorensen Department Director 7/7/2025 Name & Title Department Head Approval (Signature) Date

Vendor Name:

Tower Pest Control, Inc.

Contract Purpose:

CS-21-01 Pest Control Services for Pines Point, Pines Place and Southwest Focal Point

Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Service(s) Completed on time	25	24
2. Quality of Service(s)	30	28
3. Are all requirements of the contract being met	25	24
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	20
	100	96

A ≃	100 - 90
B =	89 - 80
C =	79 - 70
D =	69 - 60
F=	59 - 0

Recommend Renewal?

Not Applicable

Department Comments:

Pines Point, Pines Place and SWFP wishes to continue with the services provided by this company. A new bid/application shall be prepared to continue with these services.

Department Representative (Signature)

Silvia A. Aguilar Assistant Director July 16,2025

Name & Title

Date

Department Head Approval (Signature)

Jay Shechter Name & Title Director July 16,2025

Date

Vendor Name:	YRY Homes LLC	
Contract Purpose:	City-wide Litter Control	
Rating Categories	Maximum <u>Points</u>	Department Head <u>Rating</u>
1. Service(s) Completed on time	25	20
2. Quality of Service(s)	30	20
3. Are all requirements of the contract being	met 25	20
4. Department overall satisfaction	20	20
	100	80
	B = 89 C = 79 D = 69	9 - 80 9 - 70 9 - 60
	<u> </u>	9 - 0
Recommend Renewal?	Not Applic	
Recommend Renewal? Department Comments:		
	Not Applic	cable
Department Comments:		cable