

Submitted By:	<u>Agenda Item # and Questions</u>	<u>Answers/Considerations</u>
Consent Items		
Please note that Consent Agenda item #33 is being deferred by staff to the February 10, 2025 Business Meeting		
Mayfield	<p>17. Beatties Ford Sunset Pedestrian Improvements Phase 1</p> <p>The lowest bidder is around \$400,000 less than the next lowest bidder, what if any amendments are calculated for this project to ensure it does not surpass the next lowest bidder?</p>	<p>The total bid amount reflects the construction costs as proposed by the lowest qualified bidder and is intended to cover the entire project scope as outlined in the bid documents.</p> <p>This contract aligns with NCDOT standards, which allow for asphalt price adjustments based on market fluctuations. These adjustments, <i>if necessary</i>, are governed by NCDOT guidelines to ensure fair and transparent cost management.</p> <p>While the total bid amount represents a comprehensive budget, change orders may occasionally occur under typical circumstances, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unforeseen site conditions discovered during construction. • Necessary design modifications to address constructability issues. • Regulatory or code compliance requirements identified after the project begins. • Owner-requested changes to the project scope or specifications. <p>Please note as reference that from 2018 to 2024, analysis of 78 completed projects showed change orders accounted for only 3.3% of the total value of contracts awarded, reflecting strong project oversight and cost management.</p>
Mayfield	<p>18. Building Grounds Maintenance 19. Bus Park and Ride Lots Grounds Maintenance</p> <p>What is the difference in these contracts in regards to Roundtree?</p> <p>On #19 there have been multiple amendments, what was the total expenditure for #19</p>	<p>Item #19 is landscape maintenance specific to CATS facilities with slightly different scope of work. CATS relies on Landscape Management to manage this body of work on their behalf. The contract referenced in item #19 is an important part of that maintenance effort.</p> <p>For item 19, Including this amendment, the total expenditure for this contract will be \$617,435.</p>
Mayfield	<p>20. Interstate 277 Rail Trail Pedestrian Bridge</p> <p>The lowest bidder is around \$3,000,000 less than the next lowest bidder, what if any amendments are calculated for this project to ensure it does not surpass the next lowest bidder?</p>	<p>The total bid amount reflects the construction costs as proposed by the lowest qualified bidder and is intended to cover the entire project scope as outlined in the bid documents. <i>Please reference response for item 17 for additional context.</i></p>

Submitted By:	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations												
Mayfield	22. Median Maintenance Services Does Roundtree have the capacity to complete the multiple projects submitted to the City including the amended and today’s approval requests?	Yes, Roundtree has multiple crews and varied equipment which allows them to handle a variety of work. Please note, Roundtree has proven to be responsive and reliable and demonstrated the capacity to handle multiple contracts at one time.												
Mayfield	23. Specialized Roadway Construction Services The lowest bidder is around \$240,000 less than the next lowest bidder, what if any amendments are calculated for this project to ensure it does not surpass the next lowest bidder?	<p>The total bid amount reflects the costs associated with the anticipated scope of work as outlined in the contract. Since this is an on-call contract, individual task orders will be issued separately for specific scopes of work, and each will be scoped and priced independently within the overall contract amount.</p> <p>Additionally, the contract aligns with NCDOT standards, which allow for asphalt price adjustments based on market fluctuations. These adjustments, if necessary, are governed by NCDOT guidelines to ensure fair and transparent cost management. As per explanations in #17 and #20 change orders may be considered for unforeseen circumstances and/or required modifications.</p>												
Mitchell	24. Beaverdam Creek Trunk Sewer Phase 2 Please provide the Good Faith Efforts sheet for this contract.	<i>Please see attached.</i>												
Mayfield	25. Fire Hydrants and Parts Where are the bid submittals summary?	<i>Please see attached.</i>												
Mayfield	26. McDowell Creek Water Resource Recovery Facility Clarifier Mechanism Where are the bid submittals summary? Please see below: McDowell Creek Clarifer Mechanism Bid Tabulation													
		<table><tr><th>Company</th><th>Base Bid</th><th>Bid Alternative</th><th>Extended Total</th></tr><tr><td>Envirodyne Systems Inc</td><td>\$645,271.00</td><td>\$58,661.00</td><td>\$703,932.00</td></tr><tr><td>ClearWater - WesTech Engineering</td><td>\$550,041.80</td><td>\$65,618.00</td><td>\$615,659.80</td></tr></table>	Company	Base Bid	Bid Alternative	Extended Total	Envirodyne Systems Inc	\$645,271.00	\$58,661.00	\$703,932.00	ClearWater - WesTech Engineering	\$550,041.80	\$65,618.00	\$615,659.80
Company	Base Bid	Bid Alternative	Extended Total											
Envirodyne Systems Inc	\$645,271.00	\$58,661.00	\$703,932.00											
ClearWater - WesTech Engineering	\$550,041.80	\$65,618.00	\$615,659.80											
Mayfield	28. Sanitary Sewer System Modeling and Support Services Where are the other 5 submissions, bid submittals summary.	This item is different from invitations to bid (ITBs) and is a solicitation for services though a Request for Qualifications. No specific “bids” were submitted or tabulated. Each vendor submitted qualifications specific to their service offerings and experience in response to the request for qualifications requirements. Two of the six vendors moved forward based on an assessment qualification and demonstrated competence for the types of services needed.												
Mayfield	31. Bus Bulk Fluids 3 of 4 bidders were selected, what was the 4th bidder amount?	Colonial was the fourth bidder with a bid amount of \$434,265. Colonial was the low bidder, but attempted to change their price once the draft contract was sent to												

Submitted By:	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations
		them. They were then deemed non-responsive because of this.
Mayfield	35. Airport Concourse E Renovation Construction Change Order As this was noted as: The project is primarily funded by a \$32.2 million Federal Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Grant under the competitive Airport Terminals Program, what budget line item is funding this additional \$14,772,003?	The balance of the project is funded by NCDOT Airport Improvement Program Grants.
Mayfield	37. Airport Facility On-Call Painting Services I noted in 2024 businesses were identified by Council yet never received the opportunity to actually do the work. What process is now in place to ensure: (Bobby’s Painting Company, Inc. (MBE),- Charlotte Paint Company, LLC (WBE),- Stancil Painting & Services, Inc.,) receive their opportunity?	All 3 painting contractors will have immediate and continuous work due to the volume of painting required at the Airport.
Mayfield	39. Airport South Crossfield Taxiway Construction Change Order On February 13, 2023, City Council approved a contract in the amount of \$75,551,803.60 with Hi-Way Paving, Inc. for the Deicing Pad and South Crossfield Taxiway Project Package 2 for pavement and lighting for the new taxiway extensions and deicing pad. This contract due to change orders have now added an additional \$5,205,135.59, what were the other bid amounts and did any of those include some the items that amendments were approved for included in those bids?	The following contractors bid on this contract: H-Way Paving \$75,381,804 Zachry Construction \$83,249,733 Webber, LLC \$89,472,366 Lane Construction \$95,413,938 The work items in the change orders modify quantities of line items that were in the original contract, such as additional needed earthwork, electrical manhole covers, and electrical junction boxes.
Mayfield	40. Land Acquisition for Tree Canopy Preservation Program - Rocky River Church Road 41. Land Acquisition for Tree Canopy Preservation Program – Sam Wilson Road Does the “Neighborhood Development Grant Fund” have the funds available for these purchases? \$712,075 & \$594,875	Yes. For Agenda items 40. & 41: The City of Charlotte's tree ordinance allows for payment in lieu of protecting trees on site in certain commercial development situations. The money collected from the ordinance goes into the Tree Preservation & Mitigation Program Project which in Fund 2700 (Neighborhood Development Grant Fund) that is mandated for the acquisition and preservation of land to ensure that our tree canopy is maintained for future generations. The

Submitted By:	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations
		project budget currently has sufficient funds to cover both land acquisitions.
Mayfield	<p>43. Set a Public Hearing on Baucom Area Voluntary Annexation</p> <p>Do we currently have water and sewer capacity without it impacting the Catawba River?</p>	<p>This project was reviewed by Charlotte Water during the rezoning process as petition 2023-107 which was approved in April of 2024. During Charlotte Water's review of the rezoning, they noted that there is existing Charlotte water and sanitary system infrastructure that is accessible to the site via a water distribution main along John Russell Road and a sewer main along Rocky River Road. Charlotte Water did not note any impact to Catawba River during their review of the proposal.</p>
Mayfield	<p>47. Property Transactions - Cross Charlotte Trail Mallard Creek to Pavilion Segment 10, Parcel # 2</p> <p>Property Owner's Concerns: The property owner is concerned about the design of the project. How will this property be impacted by the design?</p>	<p>Two easements (permanent trail easement and temporary construction easement) are proposed for the Cross Charlotte Trail project impacting this parcel, as well as an access easement for Charlotte Water. The owner has not expressed concerns with the easements related to the trail, but has expressed concerns over the design with the Charlotte Water project that is outside the scope of this specific condemnation action. Owner's concern relates to the location of an access easement needed for the overlapping Charlotte Water project.</p> <p>The proposed Cross Charlotte Trail permanent easement runs close to the property line in an otherwise unbuildable (floodplain) area. The temporary access easement proposed for the Cross Charlotte Trail will overlap the access easement that CLTW previously condemned.</p> <p>The city will work with the property owner on options to relocate the underlying permanent Charlotte Water access easement to a more suitable location, once the Cross Charlotte Trail temporary access use is terminated upon trail construction.</p> <p>Due to construction timing / impacts, staff recommends moving forward to avoid further delay. Negotiation with the property owner is ongoing and will continue.</p>

CHARLOTTE BUSINESS INCLUSION
Connecting MWSBEs
with opportunities.

Project Name:		Beaverdam Creek Trunk Sewer Phase 2	
		BID TAB:	
	Established Goal	Committed Goal	Outcome
MBE:	8%	2.38%	Goal Not Met
Prime: State Utility Contractors			
MBE GFE Review			
4.1.1 – Contacts			
a.-	MBE	Contacted by the prime	55
	MBE	Total available to perform the specific work for this project	105
Notes: The Bid Opening was 9/12/2024. City staff identified 5 scopes of work which yielded 105 MBEs. Per CBI Form 2, 147 MBE contacts were made. After confirming active certifications, only (55) MBEs certified by the City of Charlotte were contacted. State Utility utilized the NC HUB system and not the City of Charlotte Diversity Management system aka B2GNow that is provided in the solicitation. Subsequent to the bid opening, SU Contractors submitted LOIs from Mldatlantic and Critex increasing their committed MBE goal to 2.38%			
b.-	Number of scopes target by the prime to meet the goal		20
	Total number of scopes available for this project		20
Notes: City staff identified 5 NIGP Codes. State Utility Contractors listed 20 scopes of work on CBI Form 2: 1.CLEARING AND GRUBBING 2. LANDSCAPING 3. EROSION CONTROL 4.TRAFFIC CONTROL 5. STONE AGGREGATE 6.PAVEMENT MARKING 7. PORTABLE TOILETS 8. SEEDING MATERIAL 9.PAVING & RESURFACING 10. ROCK EXCAVATION 11. CONCRETE PIPE 12. HAULING 13. CCTV INSPECTION 14. CONCRETE SUPPLY 15.LOCATE UTILITIES 16. MANHOLE AND COVER 17. PIPE, VALVE AND FITTINGS 18.SURVEYING 19. MANHOLE LINING 20. PROJECT SIGNS. Some of these scopes were broken down and are combined on a case by case basis.			
c.-	How many days before the bid was the initial contact		20
Notes: Contacts made at least ten (10) days prior to the 9/12/2024 bid opening would have been made on or before 9/2/2024. Per CBI Form 2, 55 MBE contacts were made on 8/23/2024 and follow up email 9/6/2024.			
d.-	How the initial contacts were made		Email and phone
Notes: State Utility Contractors did submit documentation.g ., email confirmation verifying their solicitation to MBEs. A phone list that appears to be an automated call to all at once, based on the time stamp was provided also.			
e.-	Substance of the Bidder's solicitation		sufficient
Notes: State Utility Contractors did submit documentation.g ., email confirmation, etc. or fax transmissions, etc. verifying their solicitation to MBEs.			
f.-	Bidder promptly and adequately responded to inquiries received		NO
Notes: State Utility Contractors did submit documentation.g ., email exchanges, etc. showing whether the responded to any inquiries from MBEs, State Utility Contractors responded to 6 inquiries, however they did not respond until the day after the bid opening. 9/13/24. State Utility Contractors submitted documentation from 3 MBEs that declined prior to the bid opening .			
g.-	Bidder follow up contacts to MSBEs that did not respond initial contact		NO
Notes: Per CBI Form 2, State Utility Contractors listed follow-up contacts to 55 certified MBEs with a date of 9/6/2024.			
4.1.2: Making Plans Available.			
	yes	Points Claimed:	10
		Points Earned:	10
Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed and received credit for this GFE. State Utility Contractors submitted a copy of the solicitation email or letter sent to MBEs with their GFE documentation.			
4.1.3: Breaking Down Work.			
	yes	Points Claimed:	10
		Points Earned:	10
Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed and received credit for this GFE. State Utility Contractors did submit a copy of the solicitation email or letter sent to MBEs with their GFE documentation. On the email sent to MBEs, State Utility Contractors stated that "quantities and scope of work would be			

supplied , if available, upon request."

4.1.4: Working With MBE Asst Organizations.

no	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.5: Attendance at Pre-Bid.

Yes	Points Claimed:	10
	Points Earned:	10

Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed credit and submitted documentation for this GFE.

4.1.6: Bonding or Insurance Assistance.

NO	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.7: Negotiating in Good Faith with MBE's

NO	Points Claimed:	10
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed credit but did not submit documentation for this GFE. There is no frequent communication demonstrating negotiation about performing a scope of work prior to the bid opening. All GFEs must occur prior to the bid opening.

4.1.8: Financial Assistance.

NO	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.9: Entering Into Joint Venture.

NO	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.10: Quick Pay Agreements.

YES	Points Claimed:	20
	Points Earned:	20

Notes: Documentation provided by State Utility Contractors shows the Quick Pay Agreements were offered on 9/26/2024 via email. GFE requirements state that "A written Quick Pay Commitment must be provided to all MBEs contacted under 4.1.1 and must be provided prior to Bid Opening."



Project Name:		Beaverdam Creek Trunk Sewer Phase 2	
---------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

	Established Goal	Committed Goal	Outcome
WBE:	3%	1.62%	Goal Not Met
SBE:			

Prime: State Utility Contractors

WBE GFE Review			

BID TAB:			
	Prime Contractor	Price	Goals Met
1st	State Utility Contractors	\$1,295,019.00	MBE-NO/WBE-NO
2nd	Sanders Utility Construction Co	\$1,380,010.54	MBE-YES/WBE-NO
3rd	Dellinger Inc.	\$1,483,652.17	MBE-NO/WBE-NO
4th	Elite Infrastructure Group	\$2,067,844.66	MBE-NO/WBE-NO
5th	Cleary Construction	\$2,633,121.46	MBE-NO/WBE-NO
Total GFE Points Claimed:		70	
Total GFE Points Earned:		60	

4.1.1 – Contacts

Points Claimed:	10
Points Earned:	10

a.-	WBE	Contacted by the prime	27
	WBE	Total available to perform the specific work for this project	27

Notes: The Bid Opening was 9/12/2024. City staff identified 5 scopes of work which yielded 27 WBEs. State Utility submitted a solicitation letter on August 23, 2024 to WBEs. Per CBI Form 2, (65) WBE contacts were made. After confirming active certifications, only (27) WBEs certified by City of Charlotte were contacted. State Utility utilized the NC HUB system and not the City of Charlotte Diversity Management system aka B2GNow that is provided in the solicitation. Subsequent to the bid opening, SU Contractors submitted LOIs from CES Group increasing their committed WBE goal to 1.62%

b.-	Number of scopes target by the prime to meet the goal	20
	Total number of scopes available for this project	20

Notes: City staff identified 5 NIGP Codes. State Utility Contractors listed 20 scopes of work on CBI Form 2: 1.CLEARING AND GRUBBING 2. LANDSCAPING 3. EROSION CONTROL 4.TRAFFIC CONTROL 5. STONE AGGREGATE 6.PAVEMENT MARKING 7. PORTABLE TOILETS 8. SEEDING MATERIAL 9.PAVING & RESURFACING 10. ROCK EXCAVATION 11. CONCRETE PIPE 12. HAULING 13. CCTV INSPECTION 14. CONCRETE SUPPLY 15.LOCATE UTILITIES 16. MANHOLE AND COVER 17. PIPE, VALVE AND FITTINGS 18.SURVEYING 19. MANHOLE LINING 20. PROJECT SIGNS Some of these scopes were broken down and are combined on a case by case basis.

c.-	How many days before the bid was the initial contact	20
-----	--	----

Notes: Contacts made at least ten (10) days prior to the 9/12/2024 bid opening would have been made on or before 9/2/2024. Per CBI Form 2, (27 WBE) contacts were made on 8/23/2024 and follow up email 9/6/2024.

d.-	How the initial contacts were made	Email and phone
-----	------------------------------------	-----------------

Notes: State Utility Contractors did submit documentation.e.g., email confirmation verifying their solicitation to WBEs. A phone list that appears to be an automated call to all at once, based on the time stamp.

e.-	Substance of the Bidder's solicitation	sufficient
-----	--	------------

Notes: State Utility Contractors did submit documentation.e.g., email confirmation, etc. or fax transmissions, etc. verifying their solicitation to WBEs.

f.-	Bidder promptly and adequately responded to inquiries received	NO
-----	--	----

Notes: State Utility Contractors did submit documentation.e.g., email exchanges, etc. showing whether the responded to any inquiries from WBEs, State Utility Contractors responded to 6 inquiries, however they did not respond until the day after the bid opening. 9/13/24. State Utility Contractors submitted documentation from 3 certified firms that declined prior to the bid opening.

g.-	Bidder follow up contacts to WBEs that did not respond initial contact	NO
-----	--	----

Notes: Per CBI Form 2, State Utility Contractors listed follow-up contacts to 27 certified WBEs with a date of 9/6/2024.

4.1.2: Making Plans Available.

yes	Points Claimed:	10
	Points Earned:	10

Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed and received credit for this GFE. State Utility Contractors submitted a copy of the solicitation email or letter sent to WBEs with their GFE documentation.

4.1.3: Breaking Down Work.

yes	Points Claimed:	10
	Points Earned:	10

Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed and received credit for this GFE. State Utility Contractors did submit a copy of the solicitation email or letter sent to WBEs with their GFE documentation. On the email sent to WBEs, State Utility Contractors stated that "quantities and scope of work would be supplied, if available, upon request."

4.1.4: Working With WBE Asst Organizations.

no	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.5: Attendance at Pre-Bid.

Yes	Points Claimed:	10
	Points Earned:	10

Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed credit and submitted documentation for this GFE.

4.1.6: Bonding or Insurance Assistance.

NO	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.7: Negotiating in Good Faith with WBE's

NO	Points Claimed:	10
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors claimed credit but did not submit documentation for this GFE. There is no frequent communication demonstrating negotiation about performing a scope of work prior to the bid opening. All GFEs must occur prior to the bid opening.

4.1.8: Financial Assistance.

NO	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.9: Entering Into Joint Venture.

NO	Points Claimed:	0
	Points Earned:	0

Notes: State Utility Contractors did not claim credit nor submit documentation for this GFE.

4.1.10: Quick Pay Agreements.

NO	Points Claimed:	20
	Points Earned:	20

Notes: Documentation provided by State Utility Contractors shows the Quick Pay Agreements were offered on 9/26/2024. GFE requirements state that "A written Quick Pay Commitment must be provided to all WBEs contacted under 4.1.1 and must be provided prior to Bid Opening."

Agenda Item 25. Fire Hydrants - bid tab

PART A: Fire Hydrants

Bidders shall indicate the manufacturer(s) and model number(s) offered. To submit pricing for more than one manufacturer and/or model number, multiple Part A tables shall be submitted.

**CITCO Water: EAST
JORDAN - 5CD250
(HYDRANTS) /
5BR250/CD250 (EXTENSIONS)**

Manufacturer / Model:				
Item	Annual Estimated Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Extended Price
1	20	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth	\$ 3,093.61	\$ 61,872.20
2	30	Hydrants, 3' 6" Bury Depth	\$ 3,157.05	\$ 94,711.50
3	30	Hydrants, 4' Bury Depth	\$ 3,220.51	\$ 96,615.30
4	10	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth, Vertical Shoe with Flange Shoe	\$ 3,248.89	\$ 32,488.90
5	10	Extension Kit – 6"	\$ 364.57	\$ 3,645.70
6	10	Extention Kit – 12"	\$ 419.67	\$ 4,196.70
7	4	Extention Kit – 18"	\$ 474.78	\$ 1,899.12
8	2	Extention Kit – 24"	\$ 534.13	\$ 1,068.26
			TOTAL	\$ 296,497.68

PART B: Fire Hydrant Parts

Manufacturer	Brand	Discount or Markup % from List Price
East Jordan Iron Works (EJ)	WaterMaster 5CD250	10% discount

PART A: Fire Hydrants

Bidders shall indicate the manufacturer(s) and model number(s) offered. To

**Ferguson - American Flow
Control / B84B****Manufacturer / Model:**

Item	Annual Estimated Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Extended Price
1	20	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth	\$ 2,805.00	\$ 56,100.00
2	30	Hydrants, 3' 6" Bury Depth	\$ 2,865.00	\$ 85,950.00
3	30	Hydrants, 4' Bury Depth	\$ 2,922.00	\$ 87,660.00
4	10	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth, Vertical Shoe with Flange Shoe	\$ 2,805.00	\$ 28,050.00
5	10	Extension Kit – 6"	\$ 341.00	\$ 3,410.00
6	10	Extension Kit – 12"	\$ 398.00	\$ 3,980.00
7	4	Extension Kit – 18"	\$ 455.00	\$ 1,820.00
8	2	Extension Kit – 24"	\$ 512.00	\$ 1,024.00
			TOTAL	\$ 267,994.00

PART B:**Fire Hydrant Parts**

Manufacturer	Brand	Discount or Markup % from List Price
American Flow Control (AFC)	B84B	5 % Discount
American Flow Control (AFC)	MK73	5 % Discount
American Flow Control (AFC)	WB77	5 % Discount

PART A: Fire Hydrants

Bidders shall indicate the manufacturer(s) and model number(s) offered. To

Core & Main -	Clow
Medallion	

Manufacturer / Model:

Item	Annual Estimated Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Extended Price
1	20	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth	\$ 3,266.00	\$ 65,320.00
2	30	Hydrants, 3' 6" Bury Depth	\$ 3,371.00	\$ 101,130.00
3	30	Hydrants, 4' Bury Depth	\$ 3,441.00	\$ 103,230.00
4	10	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth, Vertical Shoe with Flange Shoe	\$ 3,266.00	\$ 32,660.00
5	10	Extension Kit – 6"	\$ 667.00	\$ 6,670.00
6	10	Extension Kit – 12"	\$ 779.00	\$ 7,790.00
7	4	Extension Kit – 18"	\$ 884.00	\$ 3,536.00
8	2	Extension Kit – 24"	\$ 961.00	\$ 1,922.00
			TOTAL	\$ 322,258.00

PART B:**Fire Hydrant Parts**

Manufacturer	Brand	Discount or Markup % from List Price
Clow	Medallion	0% discount from list

PART A: Fire Hydrants

Bidders shall indicate the manufacturer(s) and model number(s) offered. To

Manufacturer / Model:**Consolidated Pipe and
Supply - Kennedy / K81**

Item	Annual Estimated Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Extended Price
1	20	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth	\$ 3,301.36	\$ 66,027.20
2	30	Hydrants, 3' 6" Bury Depth	\$ 3,370.76	\$ 101,122.80
3	30	Hydrants, 4' Bury Depth	\$ 3,440.16	\$ 103,204.80
4	10	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth, Vertical Shoe with Flange Shoe	\$ 3,505.87	\$ 35,058.70
5	10	Extension Kit – 6"	\$ 645.00	\$ 6,450.00
6	10	Extension Kit – 12"	\$ 772.50	\$ 7,725.00
7	4	Extension Kit – 18"	\$ 866.40	\$ 3,465.60
8	2	Extension Kit – 24"	\$ 941.69	\$ 1,883.38
TOTAL				\$ 324,937.48

PART B:**Fire Hydrant Parts**

Manufacturer	Brand	Discount or Markup % from List Price
Kennedy	K81	5 % discount from list price

PART A: Fire Hydrants
 Bidders shall indicate the manufacturer(s) and model number(s) offered. To

**Raleigh Winwater -
 Kennedy - K81A
 Guardian**

Manufacturer / Model:

Item	Annual Estimated Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Extended Price
1	20	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth	\$ 3,267.68	\$ 65,353.60
2	30	Hydrants, 3' 6" Bury Depth	\$ 3,336.37	\$ 100,091.10
3	30	Hydrants, 4' Bury Depth	\$ 3,405.07	\$ 102,152.10
4	10	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth, Vertical Shoe with Flange Shoe	\$ 3,540.43	\$ 35,404.30
5	10	Extension Kit – 6"	\$ 655.84	\$ 6,558.40
6	10	Extension Kit – 12"	\$ 765.84	\$ 7,658.40
7	4	Extension Kit – 18"	\$ 869.17	\$ 3,476.68
8	2	Extension Kit – 24"	\$ 944.17	\$ 1,888.34
			TOTAL	\$ 322,582.92

PART B: Fire Hydrant Parts

Manufacturer	Brand	Discount or Markup % from List Price
Kennedy	K81	5%

PART A: Fire Hydrants

Bidders shall indicate the manufacturer(s) and model number(s) offered. To

**FORTILINE:
MUELLER / A423****Manufacturer / Model:**

Item	Annual Estimated Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Extended Price
1	20	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth	\$ 3,085.11	\$ 61,702.20
2	30	Hydrants, 3' 6" Bury Depth	\$ 3,164.89	\$ 94,946.70
3	30	Hydrants, 4' Bury Depth	\$ 3,244.68	\$ 97,340.40
4	10	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth, Vertical Shoe with Flange Shoe	\$ 3,382.98	\$ 33,829.80
5	10	Extension Kit – 6"	\$ 670.21	\$ 6,702.10
6	10	Extension Kit – 12"	\$ 787.23	\$ 7,872.30
7	4	Extension Kit – 18"	\$ 904.26	\$ 3,617.04
8	2	Extension Kit – 24"	\$ 930.85	\$ 1,861.70
		TOTAL		\$ 307,872.24

PART B:**Fire Hydrant Parts**

Manufacturer	Brand	Discount or Markup % from List Price
Mueller	Improved	15% Plus List
Mueller	Centurion	15% Plus List

PART A: Fire Hydrants

Bidders shall indicate the manufacturer(s) and model number(s) offered. To submit pricing

FORTILINE:
EAST JORDAN / 5BR250 &
5CD250
Manufacturer / Model:

Item	Annual Estimated Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Extended Price
1	20	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth	\$ 3,004.90	\$ 60,098.00
2	30	Hydrants, 3' 6" Bury Depth	\$ 3,066.53	\$ 91,995.90
3	30	Hydrants, 4' Bury Depth	\$ 3,128.16	\$ 93,844.80
4	10	Hydrants, 3' Bury Depth, Vertical Shoe with Flange Shoe	\$ 3,154.14	\$ 31,541.40
5	10	Extension Kit – 6"	\$ 346.50	\$ 3,465.00
6	10	Extention Kit – 12"	\$ 398.76	\$ 3,987.60
7	4	Extention Kit – 18"	\$ 451.13	\$ 1,804.52
8	2	Extention Kit – 24"	\$ 507.52	\$ 1,015.04
		TOTAL		\$ 287,752.26

PART B:**Fire Hydrant Parts**

Manufacturer	Brand	Discount or Markup % from List Price
East Jordan Iron Works (EJ)	WaterMaster 5CD250	17% minus list