

MARKET SURVEY

RFP Number: 17-500434

Agent: Willie Moon

Project Name: Roof Replacement & Painting of Ground Storage Tanks at Scott Candler Water Treatment Plant

Department: Department of Watershed Management

Prepared By: Monica Millines

Date: August 8, 2017

#	Company	Contact Information	Contact Person	Received Bid Yes/No	New Contact / Address Information	Non-Response Justification	Submitting a bid in the future
1.	Astra	770.992.3900 x130 & 770.688.5659, sadams@astragroupinc.com mford@astragroupinc.com 678.521.7796	Steve Adams / Melissa Ford	Yes		Had scheduling conflicts.	Yes
2.	Horizon Commercial Roofing	jgwin@horizonroofinc.com 770.924.2119 770.676.4868	Jeff Gwinn	Yes		They are not equipped for this type of work.	Yes if qualified
3.	US Tank Team	jum@ustankteam.com 202.930.1098	Jim Bottoms	Yes		They were thankful for the consideration, but they were not sure of the exact needs of the project. Having missed the opportunity to clear up this information, they could not risk a bid that was unclear or less than professionally presented.	Yes
4.	Pittsburg Tank Tower	mjones@pttg.com 270.869.9400 x 4663	Melinda Jones	Yes		Their estimator was out on vacation.	Yes
5.	Classic Protective Coatings, Inc.	952.461.4459 brad@classicprotectivecoatings.com	Brad Smith	Yes		Not submitting a response, because the time frame to complete the project was too short and they didn't receive enough call backs from prospective welding sub-contractors or general contractors that would allow them to put a proposal together.	Yes
6.	SEH, Inc.	612.741.5411	Jason Sprague	Yes		The project has a short time-frame to prepare a high-quality and comprehensive bid package for review, they must decline at this time. In addition they indicated that there was a shortage of qualified LSBE firms and staff-persons from the approved DeKalb County list with the necessary skill sets, to join	Yes

MARKET SURVEY

						their water tank rehabilitation and maintenance team.	
7.	Rosewood Development Roofing	678.635.7276	Kris Rosendahl	Yes		Not their scope of work, they are primarily residential and new build.	Yes
8.	AW Paint & Decorating, LLC	678.654.2205	Anthony Battie	Not sure	awpaintdecorating@att.net	They may have overlooked any emails or correspondence that they may have received regarding information on this project.	Yes
9.	Pro Roofing	770.864.0825	Reggie Holiday			They thought the project would be too big for them.	Yes
10.	River To Tap	678.336.5732 sxt. 119	Georges Saoud	Yes		The project was not a good fit for them right now.	Yes
11.	2k's Commercial Roofing	678.910.2183	Luis Sandoval	Yes		Had to go out of the country	Yes
12.	Prestige Roofing	770.842.0515	Jay Thornton	Yes		This project was out of their realm.	Yes
13.	Five Star Painting	678.372.5612	Scot Specker	Yes		Out of scope. They do residential and light commercial painting.	Yes
14.	JR Painting Inc.	770.560.2149	Alejandro Ramos	Yes	office@jrpaintinginc.com	Wasn't aware of the project.	Yes
15.	Crom Coatings	352.372.3436	Cliff Dykes	Yes	352.239.9165	The company merged two divisions and with the personnel changes they decided not to submit a proposal.	Yes
16.	Utilivision, Inc.	478.397.9543	Nathan West	Yes		They are not geared up to do roof replacement	Yes, if qualified
17.	Llmas Coatings, Inc.	404.799.0384	Nathan West	Yes		They bid as a subcontractor.	Yes
18.	Caldwell Tanks Inc.	502.964.3361	Rick	No		They are no longer in this line of business. They closed a year ago.	No
19.	The Leary Construction Co. Inc.	317.462.2100	Bill Reimann	Yes		Roof replacement would have been too much for their small company.	Yes, if qualified
20.	L&M	404.420.0034	Milton Kirby	Yes		Submitted as a subcontractor.	Yes, if qualified

Results Summary: Two companies submitted as sub-contractors. Two companies indicated that the work was too big for them. Two company representatives were either on vacation or out of the country. Two companies weren't aware of the RFP because they may have overlooked any emails or correspondence that they may have received regarding information on this project. One company stated the project specifications were not clear as to the retained storage area and they entered this project too late to have the information clarified. One company indicated the time frame to complete the project was too short and they didn't receive enough call backs from prospective welding sub-contractors or general contractors that would allow them to put a proposal together. One company stated that the project has a short time frame to prepare a quality submission and there were a shortage of LSBEs firms from DeKalb's certified vendor's list with the necessary skill sets, to join their water tank rehabilitation and maintenance team. One company had scheduling conflicts. One is no longer in this line of business. One company merged two divisions and with the personnel changes they decided not submit a proposal. Six companies indicated that they could not accommodate the type of services requested within the solicitation. The pre-proposal conference was not mandatory and the submission dates were extended twice.