PMA Consultants
801 W. Ann Arbor Trail, Suite 200 ▪ Plymouth, MI 48170
Tel: 313.963.8863

Memorandum

To: *Daniel Edwards, GLWA*

From: *Scott Worth, PMA*

Date: *April 4, 2025*

Subject: *Proposal Results Evaluation - Contract No. 2401015 – 96-inch Water Transmission Main Relocation*

1.0 Summary

PMA Consultants, LLC (PMA) has been engaged by the Great Lakes Water Authority (GLWA) to review the recent procurement of Contract No. 2401015 – 96-inch Water Transmission Main Relocation. More specifically, PMA was asked to look into: 1) The large discrepancy between the executed Funds Approval Request (FAR) of $100,000,000 for the project and the proposed contract value submitted of $168,066, 286.00; 2) The fact that only one proposal was submitted, and 3) Assertions from the non-responding vendors that the lone respondent prevented key vendors from proposing on other teams. It is important to the timing of this analysis that minor delays in the project start could lead to significant delays in project completion since key elements of the work need to be completed during low demand periods and if those windows are missed, the entire project is delayed for another year waiting for the next window.

Upon review of the supplied information and thorough discussions with GLWA employees, PMA found that the RFP scope is greater than the scope that was approved in the FAR, primarily to increase the resiliency of the system throughout construction. Additionally, it appears as though several prime contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers made business decisions based on risk tolerance to not bid on the project, which resulted in a single proposal being provided.

PMA notes that should GLWA decide to take steps to receive multiple proposals, it may not necessarily result in additional proposal or a better price. Multiple firms have already likely incurred significant costs evaluating whether to propose on this project, and there is no guarantee that they will all go through the process again. Additionally, the project team has already worked with the lone proposer to reduce the proposed price to under $139,000,000. Given the current financial climate, cost uncertainty surrounding materials, and another year of cost escalation, it is not a guarantee that the price will be reduced by going back out to the market.

Based on PMA's limited review of the facts surrounding this project, PMA recommends that GLWA continue to move forward with the project, even with the single proposal provided and with the current value of the contract greatly exceeding the FAR approved amount. This recommendation assumes that the Capital Improvement Plan can absorb the increased cost, GLWA has determined that the proposer is a qualified respondent, and that this project is critical to the delivery of water to GLWA's Member Partners.

2.0 Discussion

On March 28, 2025, GLWA asked PMA to review the facts surrounding the procurement of Contract No. 2401015 – 96-inch Water Transmission Main Relocation, requesting an analysis by April 4, 2025, ahead of

the GLWA April Board Meetings. Given the limited time to review the sequence of events, PMA focused our review on the existing documents provided by GLWA procurement, documents provided by the GLWA Lifecycle Project Manager (LPM), follow-up document requests, and discussing the procurement history with the LPM. The PMA review team included individuals with a combined experience that includes contractor estimating for large infrastructure projects, project management experience of highly complex projects, and extensive experience working with GLWA and the GLWA infrastructure.

In October 2024 GLWA posted the Design/Build Contract No. 2401015 – 96-inch Water Transmission Main Relocation on Bonfire to solicit technical and cost proposals from the general vendor community. In December 2024 final proposals were due, and a single proposal was submitted by a joint venture between RicMan and Clark Construction. Along with the technical proposal, the design/build team provided a cost proposal of $168,066,286.00 to complete the work. GLWA is seeking an understanding of why the proposed amount was significantly greater than the executed FAR amount and why there was only a single proposal received. GLWA also asked PMA for its impressions on the claims made by the non-responding vendors that the only proposer locked up the only qualified vendor for a portion of the project.

2.1 Price Increase

The GLWA LPM for this project issued the attached memorandum dated March 11, 2025, which highlighted many of the differences between the FAR and the proposal. Key take aways from that memorandum include:

- The FAR was completed in March 2024 and pricing was not submitted until December 2024. PMA notes that over nine months, an escalation on a $100,000,000 project would be expected to be $3,000,000.
- There was an increase in scope after the FAR was completed and before the RFP was released in October 2024. The increased scope focused on increasing resilience of the transmission system throughout construction. The allowances for these items added $9,500,000 to the price of the project that was not captured in the FAR.
- Discussions with the proposer revealed that the contracting community priced significantly more labor and risk into the bids for the connections of the new 96-inch line to the existing line. The costs include extended 24/7 operations, the delicate removal of existing pipe without disruption of water service, and additional existing pipe preparation costs that were not included in the FAR estimate. These costs are all required to ensure the work is completed expeditiously in low demand periods without disrupting service.
- Linestop construction allows work to be done on sections of the pipe without disrupting the water service. Linestop construction on 96-inch pipe is highly specialized work with a minimum number of contractors that can complete the work and therefore there is minimal pricing data available to estimate the costs of this work. The costs for this work came in $5,500,000 higher than estimated.
- The memorandum highlights that this phase of the work decided to use the design build contract delivery method to transfer risk to the contractor for items such as linestop installation and backup services. With the transfer of risk are inherent price increases that were not fully captured in the FAR estimate.

It must be highlighted that the project management team and the proposed contractor have worked together to identify value engineering opportunities and otherwise negotiated the current proposed cost to $138,611,881.17. This represents not only costs savings, but also reflects a contractor who is interested in working with GLWA to deliver a successful project at a reduced cost. RicMan has a long history working on the GLWA system and a significant part of their portfolio is made up of GLWA work. PMA assumes that RicMan is motivated to maintain a working relationship with GLWA.

A last component of the pricing discussion must include the fact that the current construction market remains very robust, resulting in limited competition and high demand for those limited resources. In this market, contractors can command a higher profit margin that may not be viable in a slower market. It is difficult to quantify this impact, but PMA is seeing this reflected in actual bid numbers received on complex infrastructure projects, not only for GLWA, but across the country.

2.2 Single Proposal Submitted/ Subcontractor teaming agreements

In response to the lack of multiple proposals, GLWA performed an outreach to the vendors who downloaded documents but did not submit responses. GLWA noted to PMA that some responses stated that the RicMan/Clark team had locked up key resources that potentially closed the market to competitive bidding.

In response to these concerns, PMA reviewed the responses and on first pass noted that there were a surprising number of responses that appeared to have an agenda. Items included accusing one team of locking up resources, another stated that they clearly did not appreciate GLWA's post interview process, and another stated that the GLWA proposal was too time consuming without offering a stipend to proposers.

Subsequently, RicMan stated to GLWA that they did sign one of the linestop contractors to a teaming agreement. RicMan represents that the nature of the agreement was that the contractor was open to participate with other teams, but they could not share information gleaned in the RicMan/Clark team work approach. Depending on the size of the firm engaged and how much other work they had going on at the time, the linestop contractor may have determined that signing up with the one team was all they wanted to manage. Design build proposals are time consuming and costly for all active participants and finding a second resource to manage conversations with other potential prime contractors would only add to the cost and complexity.

Multiple vendors also mention that there was another qualified linestop contractor identified, but that contractor would not sign up for the contract terms that the prime contractors required.

In summary, it appears that many firms made business decisions regarding teaming agreements and risk tolerance. These are all typical decisions that are made several times over on each project that GLWA puts out to bid, however, in this case, due to limited qualified contractors at both the prime contractor and subcontractor level, the net result of these decisions was that only one team proposed on the project.

3.0 Risk with seeking new proposals

GLWA stated that going back out for another round of proposals has been considered. Assuming a strategy is developed that addresses concerns raised by vendors, there is no guarantee that a better result will be achieved.

The first item for consideration is that GLWA has worked through negotiations and value engineering efforts with the current proposer. There is now a locked in price for a contract. Going back out for another round of proposal does not guarantee that a lower price will be obtained. As previously mentioned, another year delay in the start results in another year of escalation on an extremely large project. Another item of concern is that with the ongoing threat of tariffs, there is increased price uncertainty with construction materials that will likely result in higher than expected increases in proposals.

As mentioned earlier in this analysis, responses to design build RFPs are expensive. One firm already completed the process, and based on the responses, multiple other firms likely put significant effort into a proposal before withdrawing. A response to an RFP of this size is expensive and time consuming. There is no guarantee that multiple firms will put forth the effort a second time.

Potentially the most important thing to GLWA is that a new round of proposals will cause significant delays to the project start and completion. Missing the start of each low flow period delays the project for another full year. This would greatly reduce the CIP spend rate for those years as well as result in the delay in follow up projects.

4.0 Conclusion

Following PMA's brief review of the available project information, PMA recommends GLWA continue with the approval process for this contract. Further delays in the start of the project may not decrease the overall cost of the project but will greatly impact the execution of the Capital Improvement Program.

Following project approval, there should be a lessons learned study of the project to better understand the various events that led to higher than expected pricing for this project and the lack of multiple bids. Items could include better understanding of qualified suppliers/subcontractors for specialty work, the process for confirming the FAR request still reflects the proposed project, and the potential need to set guidelines on teaming agreements as they relate to limited resources.

Attachments

CIP 122004 - 96inch WTM Phase 3 Price Gap Analysis_20250311

2401015 Vendor Response Follow-Up Revised

GLWA
Great Lakes Water Authority

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tim Kuhns, Director – Water Supply Operations Engineering

FROM: Corey Brecht, LPM – Water Supply Operations Engineering

SUBJECT: RFP 2401015 – 96-inch WTM Relocation Project Phase III

DATE: March 11, 2025

CIP 122004 - Phase 3 of the 96-inch WTM Relocation Project

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the price differences between the executed Funds Approval Request (FAR) and the RFP 2401015 received bid costs. Within the FAR, the listed estimated project costs were determined to be $100M to fully execute the scope of work identified within the RFP documents at the time of drafting the FAR. The bid received for RFP 2401015 was significantly higher than the estimated costs as illustrated in Table No. 01. Several factors may have contributed to the cost difference, but two primary reasons are listed listed below:

1) FAR approval timeframe and RFP scope changes
    a. FAR was approved in March 2024 but the RFP was not advertised until October 2024. During this period, the engineering team continued to evaluate and finalize the RFP documents including the scope of work.
    b. Internal meetings were held with Field Services and SCC to discuss additional operational strategies associated with the line stop implementation plan which led to an additional allowance incorporated for rehabilitation and improvements at the Dorsey Dickinson Valve (DDV).
    c. GLWA experienced water leaks at the I-Valve Train No. 03 assembly located at North Service Center (NSC). This leak was temporarily repaired to avoid a prolonged shutdown of the 96-inch WTM at NSC. The opportune timeframe for replacement of the valves and piping for I-Valve Train No. 03 is during Phase III when the 96-inch WTM is isolated for connections between NSC and RBPS. The project team included additional scope for removal and replacement of this assembly which will be funded from a new project allowance.

2) Line Stop Cost Estimate
    a. GLWA entered an agreement with RA Consultants (RA) to perform an independent line stop feasibility study on the existing 96-inch PCCP WTM. In the study, RA reviewed two locations and two different configurations involving single or double line stops. A requirement of the feasibility study was to provide cost estimates associated with the different line stop options. The costs

provided in the study were approximately 44% less than the received line stop costs within the bid. Refer to Table No. 01

CIP 122004 – Phase 1-3 Project Costs

In addition to the Phase 3 price analysis, the project team has been tracking the overall costs compared to the original 90% OPCC provided by GLWA's consultant in 2022. As of March 11, 2025, the project is forecasted to be below the anticipated costs outlined in the original 90% OPCC. This primarily is a result of the project team's willingness to makes changes and deliver the project within phases utilizing a contract delivery method that best suites the scope of work. The project phases resulted in the below delivery methods:

1) Phase 1 – Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR)
    a. This delivery method was selected due to the high risk involved with the overall project and final connections of the new WTM.
    b. The project later evolved into phase 1 & 2 under the CMAR contract due to the SRF funding constraints
    c. The CMAR contract delivery method was deemed unnecessary when the GLWA project team decided to further divide the project into Phase 2 & 3 due to SRF funding and the finalization of the implementation plan. Additionally, GLWA was unable to agree on a reasonable cost for Phase 2 with the CMAR contractor and decided to terminate the contract. This resulted in approximately $70M in savings in Phase 2.

2) Phase 2 - Traditional Design/Bid/Build
    a. GLWA and its consultant developed final bid package for Phase 2 that comprised of additional 8,000LF of pipe to complete work within Oakland County Road Commissions' ROW. Phase 2 was low risk since the scope involved additional pipe installation with no connections to the existing system.
    b. Phase 2 scope and limits were also a factor in the SRF funding schedule. There wasn't sufficient time to finalize an entire scope involving connections, isolation valves, backup water service plans, and temporary backup facilities. If SRF funding approval did not occur during FY 2023, there was a potential for Phase 3 to not qualify for funding in future fiscal years.

3) Phase 3 – Design-Build Contract
    a. The project team decided on a Design-Build contract delivery method for Phase 3 based on the below reasons:
        i. Risks involved with implementation for final connections involving the lines top and backup services
        ii. Qualification based selection to ensure the right team was involved, specifically the line stop specialty contractor
        iii. Contractor constructability input during the final design process involving the line stops, backup plans, and final connections.

Although, Phase 3 costs are higher than anticipated, the overall project has benefited from the above strategy to minimize overall costs throughout the 7 year long duration of this critical CIP project. Table No. 02 shows the comparison of the original CMAR delivery method, mixed delivery method strategy, the original 90% OPCC and the revised 90% OPCC. The project team has continued to evaluate costs and scope to ensure GLWA is achieving the objective of the project while staying within the original estimates for the entire project (Phases 1-3).

Table No. 01

RFP 2401015 - Cost Table	Estimate	Bid Price	Negotiated Costs	Comments
Task 1 - Project Management	*Included throughout below facilities*	$ 23,087,000.00	$ 19,059,409.27	Estimated GC's, OH&P, Escalation, Bonds & Insurance costs were divided among the the estimated individual Facilties 1-6
Task 2 - Risk Management	$ 5,500,000.00	$ 142,000.00	$ 142,000.00	
Task 3 - Basis of Design		$ 2,607,000.00	$ 2,385,277.00	
Task 4 - 95% Design		$ 1,369,000.00	$ 1,312,976.00	
Task 5 - 100% Design		$ 210,000.00	$ 200,300.00	
Chesterfield Loop Temporary Booster Pump Station (CLTBPS)	$ 15,000,000.00	$ 11,315,014.00	$ 7,574,198.17	This scope change encompasses the elimination of the prefabricated pump station at Snover Road and replacement with a temporary stand alone pumping system and header. The savings amount is based on the use of diesel operated pumps with backup generator power and includes all of the necessary telemetry and electrical for remote operation.
Linestop Construction	$ 7,000,000.00	$ 12,481,942.00	$ 12,481,942.00	
Facilities 1,2,3,5,6	$ 68,000,000.00	$ 95,554,330.00	$ 82,755,778.73	Large cost difference on Facility 2 - Pipe Installation and Final Connections. Cost per LF is close to average costs experienced on past projects. The higher costs are asscoiated with connection points, 24-7 labor, cautious pipe removal, and preperation of existing pipe for final connections in three locations
Subtotal	**$ 95,500,000.00**	**$ 146,766,286.00**	**$ 125,911,881.17**	
Allowances				
Provisional Allowance	$ 6,000,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	$ 2,500,000.00	Modified RFP documents increased provisional allowance after FAR approval
Permit Allowance	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00	
Temp Station Utility Allowance	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	
Scada Allowance	$ 200,000.00	$ 200,000.00	$ -	Removed in negotiation due to VE items and scope changes
DDV Allowance	$ -	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 5,000,000.00	DDV allowance and scope change after the FAR approval
LSIP Allowance	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ -	
Owner Furnished Material Use Tax	$ 200,000.00	$ 200,000.00	$ 200,000.00	
I-Valve Allowance	$ -	$ 4,500,000.00	$ 4,500,000.00	DDV allowance and scope changed after the FAR approval
Hydraulic Modeling Allowance	$ -	$ -	$ 100,000.00	Moved modeling efforts from Task 3 into an allowance. Level of effort should be minimal based on the existing model to be shared with the DB team once project is awarded.
Total	**$ 103,300,000.00**	**$ 168,066,286.00**	**$ 138,611,881.17**	

Table No. 02

Project Scope	Scenario No 01- CMAR Contract - Kiewit	Scenario No 02 - Mixed Contract Delivery Method	Jacobs 90% OPCC (Including Allowances and Revised Phase 3 Scope)	Jacobs 90% OPCC (Before Phase 3 Final Scope)
Phase 1	$ 38,699,440.00	$ 38,699,440.00	$ 35,342,098.50	$ 35,342,098.50
Phase 2	$ 128,886,242.00	$ 52,350,500.00	$ 207,666,667.00	$ 232,000,000.00
Phase 3 (including Linestop)	$ 179,000,000.00	$ 138,611,881.17		
Jacobs Engineering Contract (Phase 1-3)	$ 31,510,086.00	$ 31,510,086.00	$ 31,510,086.00	$ 31,510,086.00
Phase 1 & 2 Pipe Purchase (GLWA Pre-purchase)	$ 9,237,583.00	$ 9,237,583.00	Included in Phase 2 & 3 above	Included in Phase 2 & 3 above
84-inch Valve Purchase (GLWA Pre-purchase)	$ 3,240,588.46	$ 3,240,588.46	Included in Phase 2 & 3 above	Included in Phase 2 & 3 above
Other Costs	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000.00
Future Abandonment Phase	Included in Phase 2 & 3 above	$ 8,500,000.00	Included in Phase 2 & 3 above	Included in Phase 2 & 3 above
Subtotal	**$ 390,573,939.46**	**$ 282,150,078.63**	**$ 274,518,851.50**	**$ 299,852,184.50**
RCOC Cost Share Agreement Phase 1	$ (1,633,328.41)	$ (1,633,328.41)	$ -	$ -
RCOC Cost Share Agreement Phase 2	$ (2,194,534.71)	$ (2,194,534.71)	$ -	$ -
Total Project Costs	**$ 386,746,076.34**	**$ 278,322,215.51**	**$ 274,518,851.50**	**$ 299,852,184.50**

	Removed (2) discharge facilities, (2) 84" Valves, and added linestop estimate of $7M based on revised Phase 3 scope
	Forcasted cost at completion
	Engineer's OPCC did not include cost share agreements

GLWA Procurement			
Effective Date: 7/1/2024	**Document #:** FSA_PRO_TPL_0025	**Revision Date:** N/A	**Revision#:** 0
Document Title: Vendor Response Follow-up		**Document Owner/Department:** Procurement Team	

Contract No. 2401015/Design Build for 96-Inch Water Transmission Main Relocation Phase 3
Date: 1/23/2025

Vendor	Contact Name	Email Address	Explanation of No Bid Submittal
Brown and Caldwell, LLC	David Nitz	dnitz@BrwnCald.com	Brown and Caldwell, LLC submitted as a design partner/subcontractor with the Clark/Ric-Man JV Proposal.
AECOM Great Lakes, Inc	Robert Green	Bob.Green@aecom.com	AECOM had not positioned ourselves with a suitable contractor to provide the best project execution for GLWA.
Carollo Engineers, Inc.	Michael Van Antwerp	MVanAntwerp@carollo.com	Carollo thought the project was an exciting challenge, but we were unable to identify a suitable Design-Build partner for the pursuit.
Geo-Cell Solutions, Inc.	Tarin Winton	tmwinton@sbcglobal.net	Geo-Cell Solutions is not a design firm. We are a subcontractor.
GEI Consultants of Michigan, P.C	Michael C. Gentner	mgentner@geiconsultants.com	We did not intend to submit as a prime. We were plan holders for our support of prime teams proposing.
American Cast Iron Pipe Company	Caelan March	cmarch@american-usa.com	As a manufacturer specializing in ductile iron and spiral-weld steel pipes, we are unable to address the full scope of the project requirements.

Benesch	Chris Carr	CCarr@benesch.com	We were unable to establish a teaming agreement with a contractor and cost associated with pursuing a project that does not pay a stipend for the proposal cost could not be justified.
Harrington Industrial Plastics	Frank Jaehnig	fjaehnig@hipco.com	We are a distributor of specialty piping products and would not bid a project directly like that.
Brierley Associates	Steven M. Vinci	svinci@brierleyassociates.com	Brierley Associates is a specialty geostructural/tunnel and trenchless design firm and not contractor. However, we do work with many of the regional contractors, as a subconsultant, who pursue projects like this. Since we fill a subconsultant role, we would not be submitting as a prime.
LGC Global	Karen Haydett	karen.haydett@lgccorp.com	There was not enough time for LGC to assemble a bid for this complex project. We requested that GLWA extend the bid due date, but the response was NO. Hence, we decided NOT to submit a bid.
JETT Pump and Valve, L.L.C.	Jennifer Greene	jgreene@jettpump.com	JETT provided a proposal to contractors (De-Cal and Ric-Man).
Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.	Janice Strine	JStrine@hrcengr.com	HRCs Business Development team downloads documents as received and evaluates if the scope aligns with our current business model. Our team assessed the referenced RFP and determined it did not fit at this time.
PCI Vetrix	Hassan Ajami	hajami@pci-vetrix.com	We submitted as a subcontractor to the electrical firms. This is not a project scope we could perform directly.

Pre-Construction Media	Nandish Doshi	dish@preconstructionmedia.com	We are just a subcontractor that provides Above Ground Audio/Video for Projects.
Project Amazing	Bill Hunter	wmhunter02@aol.com	I represent equipment suppliers who sell their goods to the various contractors. We do not bid construction projects direct.
Mokveld USA	Mina Georgy	Mina.Georgy@mokveld.com	We are a valve manufacturer only and we couldn't bid the whole project scope since it involves many items that are not within our products range.
Rotor Electric Company of Michigan, LLC	Benjamin Rosenberg	brosenberg@rotorelectric.com	First, the nature of the project is such that it is not in the area of Rotor Electric Company of Michigan's expertise to take the lead and performing the bulk of the work. Second, Rotor Electric Company of Michigan is engaged with the purpose (Clark/Ric-Man) as the Electrical Subcontractor on the project and did submit to them for the electrical portion of the project.
Temoney Banks Consulting, LLC	Nicole Banks	info@temoneybanksconsulting.com	Our organization is more of a subcontractor than a Prime submitting for the entire project. We provide Project Management, Project Controls (cost & schedule), Change management, subcontractor & vendor management, auditing of Payment Applications, IT Strategy & Acquisition Support.

TRC Companies	Shirlene Davis	Davis, Shirlene Shirlene.Davis@trccompanies.com	Not enough time to submit proposal.
Z Contractors, Inc.	Blake Zapczynski	bzap@z-contractors.com	This project did not fit with our current workload.
Wm Floyd Company	Jason Axelson	jaxelson@wmfloyd.net	Wm Floyd Co. is a mechanical contractor. Our current contributions for the water/wastewater industry are primarily HVAC. We were in preliminary talks to quote the HVAC scope of work on this project; however, nothing further came of it.
NTH Consultants, Ltd.	Lisa Dilg	LDilg@nthconsultants.com	Based on the experience and expertise required for this work, we understand that only a few specialized contractors are capable of performing it. Unfortunately, while we were very interested in the consulting engineering scope, we couldn't secure the right construction teaming partners.
Jacobs	Jason Matteo	Jason.Matteo@jacobs.com	Jacobs is serving as the Owner's Agent to GLWA for this project; therefore, we were precluded from proposing on the Design-Build.
Kennedy Industries	Bryan Davidson	bdavidson@kennedyind.com	We did bid this but direct to a contractor as we are just a supplier.
Verdantas	Gregory Bushey	GBushey@verdantas.com	Verdantas (formerly CT Consultants) did not provide GLWA with a proposal because we were unable to assemble a team to prepare a competitive proposal.

RA Consultants	Tony Marconi	tmarconi@raconsultantsllc.com	RA Consultants (now Gonzalez Companies, LLC) joined the Clark Construction/Ric-Man Construction Joint Venture Team for this project This response is for RA Consultants and Gonzalez Companies.
Hamlett Engineering Sales Co DBA HESCO Group	Heather Walker	heather.walker@hesco-mi.com	HESCO was unable to submit a bid directly to GLWA as we are only a supplier.
*WSP Michigan, Inc.	James Rydquist	James.Rydquist@wsp.com	WSP was very interested in submitting on this work, and we collaborated with our same team that completed the 81-inch transmission main - waterworks park to NE, phase 2 project. Our contractor Dan's Excavating was leading the proposal efforts and we proceeded very far along into the process before being told by the Line-stop vendor we were talking with that they were going to agree to be Sole Source with the Ric-Man team. There are only 2 vendors for this type of work and the other vendor was not willing to agree to the liability terms that Dan's Excavating would need. In addition, Dan's Excavating found out that the Steel Pipe vendor also agreed to a sole-source agreement with Ric-Man. With the pricing of the work being important and part of the submittal and the difficulties working with the remaining line stop vendor, Dan's Excavating decided to No Go the work and as a team we would not move forward.

			****Please refer to the Procurement Note on pg. 9 of this survey.***
*LGC Global	Karen Haydett	karen.haydett@lgccorp.com	LGC Global assembled a team and endeavored to bid on RFP-2401015 Design Build for 96-inch Water Transmission Main Relocation Phase. As you may know, the project scope was highly specialized as it required line stopping services. There are a limited number of qualified companies nationwide capable of performing this type of work. We contacted one reputable company and learned they had signed an exclusive teaming agreement with a competitor who was also bidding on this project. We continued our search and identified another qualified line-stopping company willing to provide pricing. Understandably, this company needed time to review and study the RFP documents. We promptly contacted GLWA Procurement staff on December 5, 2024, to request a 30-day extension of the bid due date (from December 17, 2024 to January 17, 2025). We were advised the next day our request was denied because it would affect the overall project schedule. Despite our best efforts, we were unable to provide a suitable, comprehensive bid by the deadline date. ****Please refer to the Procurement Note on pg. 9 of this survey.***

Wade Trim Associates	April Mack	amack@wadetrim.com	Wade Trim routinely downloads GLWA RFPs from Bonfire to evaluate opportunities to pursue. We reviewed the RFP and held multiple teaming conversations with a prime Contractor and engineering partners, however, the Contractor ultimately elected to not pursue this RFP due to the level of risk and lack of availability of the specialty subcontractors required to complete the scope of work.
Weiss Construction Co., LLC	Sherry Field	sfield@weissconstruction.com	Weiss Construction did not submit a proposal for RFP-2401015 because the project is not in our usual scope of work.
Corrosion Specialists	Dan Mankivsky	danm@corrosionspecialists.com	We are only a subcontractor.
*L. D'Agostini & Sons, Inc.	Michael D'Agostini	miked@ldagostini.com	L.D'Agostini & Sons would have liked to bid on the project but unfortunately there were a few factors that prohibited us from bidding or had the potential for a unknown liability that ultimately, we decided to not bid. The biggest of the factors is that there are only 1 or 2 contractors in the US that we are capable of doing the 96" Line stops. Of those two there is only one that would possibly provide a guarantee and bonding. We had contacted them, but another contractor, presumably Ric-Man Construction, already had them under an agreement that prohibited them from bidding to anyone else. This effectively eliminated anyone else

			from bidding on this project because without that contractor you wouldn't be able to do the job. We also take issue with the arbitrary methods used in GLWA's Post bid interviewing on past projects. We feel a more measurable method needs to be used if an interview process is going to be the method. ****Please refer to the Procurement Note on pg. 9 of this survey.***
Walsh Group	Joseph Firas	fjoseph@walshgroup.com	We did not bid the referenced project due to other opportunities we were pursuing and resources already committed. Walsh is better positioned in the market to pursue plant-based work vs. the transmission main or sewer main work.
Hach	Ben Scrace	Ben.Scrace@hach.com	Thank you for your email and I'm happy to provide an explanation as to why Hach did not provide a bid for the above reference project. Unless I completely misunderstood the scope of the project, this bid is for the design and construction of the 96" transmission line. Hach is an manufacturer of water quality analyzers and therefore would not submit a bid directly to GLWA as a engineer/contractor. Hach works with system integrations and engineering firms during the design stage ensuring the correct equipment is selected for application. In the case of this project there is a single chlorine analyzer with

			transmitter which most integrators and engineers shown on the sign-in sheets are familiar with.

***Procurement Note:**

1. There was one (1) time extension granted on this project. The project was advertised for 9 weeks. The second request for a time extension was denied. Phase I and II of the 96-Inch water transmission main were SRF funded. Per the project manager, the current P6 bid schedule from the Design Build team shows some of the critical design phase items being completed in January/February of 2026. These milestones are important to the procurement and establishment of the temporary pumping configuration that needs to be installed prior to October 2026 for testing during the low demand season. If these milestones are not achieved, it could push the overall schedule an entire year due to the seasonal constraints for our system connections. This will also drastically change forecasted FY spend. We need to try and keep as much float in the schedule to avoid any delays during the final design phase and implementation/testing of the temporary booster station. The final system connections cannot occur without the temporary station as the implementation plan describes.
2. Related to the issue of the vendor selected having sole agreements with subcontractors, none of the vendors interested in this project brought this to GLWA's attention during the solicitation period. GLWA had no knowledge of any sole agreement with the subcontractors until we received responses for this vendor survey.