



## Finance Department

David P. Schmiedicke, Finance Director


City-County Building, Room 406  
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
Phone: (608) 266-4521  
Fax: (608) 266-5948  
[finance@cityofmadison.com](mailto:finance@cityofmadison.com)  
[www.cityofmadison.com/finance/purchasing](http://www.cityofmadison.com/finance/purchasing)

Purchasing Services

### City of Madison Proposal Award Recommendation

#### Proposal award recommended by:

Department name: Engineering

Department leadership name: Jim Wolfe Initials:  Date: 4-27-2026

**Project name:** Planning & Design for Lake Forest Lift Station - REBID **RFP number:** 15016-0-2026-BP

#### Project description:

The City of Madison Engineering Department and the Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District reviewed the age, condition, and capacity of the Lake Forest Lift Station, located at 2021 Dickson Place, and determined that the pumps and control equipment are in need of replacement.

The deliverables will include a detailed design report for the project; Detailed plan drawings required for construction; Detailed specifications to be used for bidding using the City's standard Advertisement; Instructions to Bidders, General Conditions, and Contract forms; Provide miscellaneous services during bidding and construction, including design-related clarifications for bidders, attendance at pre-bid conference, preparation of addenda and/or plan and specification revisions (if needed), review of submittals and shop drawings, and provide design-related clarifications for construction Contractor that may come up during construction; Provide the City with paper and electronic copies of all contract documents; Provide a cost estimate for the final design chosen; and Prepare and provide all permit applications as required to construct the lift station in accordance with Request for Proposals (RFP).

Please note that this is a rebid of RFP 15000-0-2026-BP. That RFP was "no awarded" due all submitted costs higher than the budget.

#### Contract term:

Initial term: From date of execution through May 1, 2028.

Number of potential renewals: NA

#### Award amount:

Initial term award amount: \$105,875

Total potential award amount, including all future renewals\*: \$105,875

The award amount is:  Actual contract amount  Estimated contract amount (if yes, explain below)

The Contract Award includes price adjustment terms:  No  Yes (if yes, explain below)

Additional amount information: The amount listed is the intended amount. However, in the past there have been variables that can arise as the process and may require further funding.

**Budget information:**Is there grant funding associated with this project:  Yes  NoGL Account: 140083-54660Project Account: 14626-83-173 Award is contingent on additional budget approval: NA Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Budget Comment: Sufficient budget authority already exists in the Lift Station Rehab program

Current year commitment	\$150,000	Next year commitment*	\$
Current budget available	\$157,000	Next year budget available*	\$

\*The City may terminate any contract with no penalty if the Common Council fails to appropriate funds for the continuation of the contract for any ensuing fiscal year.

**Number of proposals received:** 3**List Proposers' names.**

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. Roth Professional Services, Inc.
3. Short Elliott Hendrickson Inc. (SEH)

Panel members first conducted evaluations of proposals independently based on the pre-established criteria determined by the panel. Then, the panel met to discuss all qualitative and quantitative aspects of the proposals and overall ratings as a group. Purchasing staff rated the cost section of the proposals.

Below is a summary of the scoring:

Max Points	Section	AECOM	Roth	SEH
55	Questions Total	42.83	35.42	49.17
40	Cost	26.05	40.00	21.40
5	Local Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00
100		68.89	75.42	70.56

After the first round of evaluations, the panel had additional questions for AECOM and Roth. Each company was asked specific questions related to their particular technical proposals and supplied answers to a satisfactory level of the evaluation panel. Following this, based on the scoring, the panel felt comfortable selecting the top scoring vendor, Roth Professional Services, as the recommended awarded vendor.

**Local Vendor Preference**

- How many proposers qualified for Local Preference? **0**
- Was the selected proposer qualified for Local Preference? **No**
- Did Local Preference influence the outcome of this RFP? **No**

**Final Award of Evaluation Panel: Roth Professional Services****Additional information (optional):** NAPurchasing Representative: Brian Pittelli Signature: Brian Pittelli Date: 4/28/2026Purchasing Supervisor: Mary Richards Signature: Mary C. Richards Date: 4/28/2026