



Procurement Form (FOR)

Effective Date:
5/1/2019

Document #:
FSA_PRO_FOR_0039

Revision Date:
1/18/2022

Revision#:
1

Document Title:
Procurement Board Report-RFP

Document Owner/Department:
Procurement Team

Date: March 21, 2022
To: Suzanne R. Coffey, P.E., Chief Executive Officer
From: Daniel Edwards, Procurement Manager
Re: Procurement Report

General Information

Contract Number:	2004674	Project Owner:	Michael Garrett
Contract Title:	Engineering, Design, and Construction Assistance Services for North Service Center Pump Station Improvements		
Vendor:	CDM Smith Michigan, Inc.		
Budget:	Capital Project		

Procurement Method

Competitively bid – Request for Proposal (RFP) Qualification Based Selection (QBS) – Evaluation Committee			
Advertised:	11-5-21	Addendums released:	1
Buyer:	Gerald Moore	Downloaded by:	86
Response due date:	12-21-21	Responses received:	3

Cost Summary – CDM Smith Michigan, Inc.

Description	Proposed Cost	Negotiated Cost
Task 1 – Project Kickoff Meeting	\$63,031.13	\$58,611.13
Task 2 – Project Management	955,384.61	955,384.61
Task 3 – Conceptual Design	1,950,126.55	1,950,126.55
Task 4 – Preliminary (30%) Design	2,215,651.92	2,215,651.92
Task 5 – Final Design	2,461,799.51	2,461,799.51
Task 6 – Bid and Award	168,960.07	168,960.07
Task 7 – Construction Administration	3,794,565.32	3,746,443.33
Task 8 – Resident Project Representation	1,786,552.06	1,786,552.06
Task 9 – System O&M Manual Updating, SOPs and Training	487,561.18	487,561.18
Task 10 – Provisional Allowance	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
Totals	\$14,883,632.35	\$14,831,090.36

Provisionary Allowance is an amount included in the Contract Price to reimburse the Contractor for the cost to furnish and perform Work that is uncertain. Any remaining balance upon Final Completion shall be retained by the GLWA and not paid to the Contractor.



Procurement Form (FOR)

Effective Date:
5/1/2019

Document #:
FSA_PRO_FOR_0039

Revision Date:
1/18/2022

Revision#:
1

Document Title:
Procurement Board Report-RFP

Document Owner/Department:
Procurement Team

Benchmarking was completed by comparing the proposals for this project. This analysis confirmed that rates are in competitive range. The rate comparisons and allowances (if any) are illustrated in the attached cost tabulation.

While CDM's cost proposal was the highest, their proposal demonstrated that they best understood the project challenges of all the proposals received. CDM's proposal also provides added value during the construction administration phase of the project through substantially added hours spent by discipline leads on site during construction to support oversight and added assurance that the design intent is met.

Evaluation Committee: (Designation - Organization)

A - Engineer - GLWA

B - Team Leader - GLWA

C - Engineer - GLWA

D - Systems Planning and Development Director Planning Services- GLWA

E - Systems Control Center Manager - GLWA

Evaluation Score(s) - Maximum Score Possible: 100

The Evaluation Committee independently reviewed and scored the proposals in accordance with GLWA's policy. The rankings are below.

Vendor (Highest to lowest score)	Score without B.I.D.	Score with B.I.D.
CDM Smith Michigan, Inc.	78.81	81.81
HDR Michigan	68.51	71.51
Arcadis of Michigan	65.84	68.84

Vendor Name	B.I.D. Plan (Pass/Fail)	Score w/o B.I.D.	State of Michigan (1 pt.)	GLWA Territory Area (1 pt.)	Economically Disadvantaged Territory (1 pt.)	Score w/B.I.D.	Certifications
CDM Smith Michigan, Inc.	Pass	78.81	1	1	1	81.81	Yes
HDR Michigan	Pass	68.51	1	1	1	71.51	None
Arcadis of Michigan	Pass	65.84	1	1	1	68.84	None



Procurement Form (FOR)

Effective Date:
5/1/2019

Document #:
FSA_PRO_FOR_0039

Revision Date:
1/18/2022

Revision#:
1

Document Title:
Procurement Board Report-RFP

Document Owner/Department:
Procurement Team

Business Inclusion and Diversity (B.I.D.)

- B.I.D. program required B.I.D. program not required
- The recommended vendor for award submitted a B.I.D. plan per the requirements under this solicitation.
- The recommended vendor for award did not submit a B.I.D. plan per the requirements under this solicitation.
- The vendor received points for the following scored criteria:
- Business presence in State of Michigan
- Business presence in GLWA service territory area (list the territory)
- Business presence in economically disadvantaged GLWA service territory area (list the territory)

Other Data Requested by GLWA Board Members

Minority Business Enterprise (MBE): No
Small Business Enterprise (SBE): No
Woman Business Enterprise (WBE): No
Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE): No
Detroit Based Business (DBB): Yes
Other:

Sub-Contractor(s) List:

Somat Engineering, Inc.
Metco Services, Inc.
Clemson Engineering Hydraulics
Carollo
AEW
Corrosion Probe, Inc.
GZA Geo Environmental, Inc.

Vendor Response Survey: Not applicable



Procurement Form (FOR)

Effective Date:
5/1/2019

Document #:
FSA_PRO_FOR_0039

Revision Date:
1/18/2022

Revision#:
1

Document Title:
Procurement Board Report-RFP

Document Owner/Department:
Procurement Team

Litigation

This vendor is not currently nor has been previously involved in any litigation with the GLWA.

Financials

A financial risk assessment was performed by the GLWA via Dun & Bradstreet and was determined that the selected vendor has the financial capacity to perform the tasks under this contract. This information is available for the Board of Directors to review upon request.

Previous Contract

Previous contract holder: Not applicable