



## **RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTRACTOR SELECTION**

### **DDA RFP 24-01 (DEMOLITION) AND DDA RFP 24-02 (SALVAGE)**

To: DDA BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
From: Matthew Gibb, Executive Director

Meeting Date: November 19, 2024

---

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

This office was charged with publishing certain Request(s) for Proposal concerning the Lumber Yard at Paint Creek and reviewing any properly submitted proposals for consideration of contractor selection for the scope of work described in the approved RFP documents. As outlined and supported in this Memorandum, PETERSON BROTHERS, LLP of Roseville, Michigan is recommended for selection as the contractor for BOTH RFP 24-01 and RFP 24-02 to enter contract negotiations seeking a final contract to complete the scope of work set forth in each Request.

This Memorandum documents the steps taken in accordance with the procurement policies of both the Village of Lake Orion and the Lake Orion Downtown Development Authority. Documentation supporting the process of publication, review and recommendation is included in this Memorandum which shall serve as affirmation that proper steps were taken, including legal review where necessary.

#### **PROCESS AND COMPLIANCE**

1. The DDA Board authorized the publication of the two RFP packages by Motion and Action at its October 15, 2024 regularly noticed public meeting.
2. RFP 24-01 (Demolition) was published on October 17, 2024 by posting the RFP on the DDA website, entering the RFP as an open bid on BidNet, the states government bid network, and sending the RFP to interested parties and known contractors.
3. RFP 24-02 (Salvage) was published on October 18, 2024 by posting the RFP on the DDA website, entering the RFP as an open bid on BidNet, the states government bid network, and sending the RFP to interested parties and known contractors.
4. A walk through of the site, and answering of in person questions, was conducted for BOTH RFP's on October 30, 2024, at 2:00pm and 4:00pm, respectively. A list of attendees was retained for DDA records.
5. Communications were completed to clarify and direct RFP details and to answer direct questions. Communications affecting the RFP's were published on the DDA website, BidNet, and emailed to all attendees of each walkthrough and all firms who had submitted inquiry to this office.
6. Proposers were authorized to submit proposals by delivering the proposal to the DDA office at 118 N Broadway, or by electronic delivery to the email address of the DDA Executive Director.
7. All proposals received at the DDA Office were handed to the Executive Director and placed in a secure box for opening as prescribed in the RFP and communications.
8. All proposals received via Email delivery were unopened and moved into a separate folder. On the morning of the noticed opening, the Executive Director printed three copies of each proposal and placed the same in a sealed envelope for opening by the convened panel.

9. An opening of sealed proposals was conducted on November 13, 2024 at 9:00am and a supplemental convening of the panel to review additional proposals that were deemed to be submitted within the time limit stated in each RFP was conducted on November 14, 2024 at 3:45pm.
10. All proposals were reviewed by the panel for accuracy, price, references and content and referred to the Executive Director to complete this recommendation in accord with the comment and direction of the panel. Those participating on behalf of the DDA are noted as signatories to the Bid Tabulation Sheet(s).

### SUMMARY OF REVIEW

The proposals represent a wide span of both cost, inclusion of necessary environmental abatement(s), and certain firms offering a combined approach to the scope of work. The reviewing panel, as well as this office, affirmed that, due to the condition and severity of the structures and debris, the preferred contractor selection would not be based solely on proposed cost. The walk through, outlined in the RFP documents, was “Strongly Encouraged” and those that took advantage of the walk through, and paid attention to the subsequent clarifications and communications, noted aspects of the DDA priority in their response. Several very qualified firms submitted proposals.

Subjective review of the totality of the bids, included but was not limited to:

1. Whether it was in the best interests of the DDA to have separate firms doing each portion of the scope.
2. How timing would be coordinated between salvage and final demolition.
3. Did the proposal acknowledge the hazardous materials report and how did each propose handling that matter in the two effected buildings.
4. Start timing and proposed completion estimates.
5. Knowledge of the site, community and permitting process.
6. General reputation and reference-based ability of the proposer.

The recommendation is based on the direct and subjective review of all proposals. Given a totality all aspects of the many proposals, this office believes using a single contractor for both RFP scope(s) is beneficial in both cost and timing. The recommended firm bets acknowledged the hazardous materials and has estimated the cost for performing both RFP scope(s) in accord with the preliminary estimating completed by the Executive Director. The recommended contractor has a working knowledge of the site, permitting, abatement, and all references supported it’s ability to perform.

### RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, and in accord with the procurement policy and standards therein, it is recommended that the Lake Orion DDA select PETERSON BROTHERS, LLP as the proposed contractor for RFP 24-01 and RFP 24-02 and direct the DDA Executive Director to submit for concurrence from the Village Council for the Village of Lake Orion at its next available meeting and upon such action negotiate an appropriate contract at a cost not to exceed the combined proposal cost from Peterson Brothers, LLP of \$76,039.85.