



Procurement Form (FOR)

Effective Date:
5/1/2019

Document #:
FSA_PRO_FOR_0041

Revision Date:
N/A

Revision#:
0

Document Title:
Vendor Response Follow-up

Document Owner/Department:
Procurement Team

Contract No. 2202790
Date: 12/6/2022

Vendor	Contact Name	Email Address	Explanation of No Bid Submittal
Detroit Pump	Gary Maley	Gary.Maley@detroitpump.com	"We are an equipment supplier and provide pricing of our equipment to consultants and general contractors on projects like this."
Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.	Janice Strine	jstrine@hrcengr.com	"HRC's Business Development team downloads documents as received and evaluates if the scope aligns with our current business model. Our team assessed the referenced RFP and determined it did not fit at this time."
Kennedy Industries	Keith Sikaitis	ksikaitis@kennedyind.com	"We were looking at the Project as an Equipment Supplier and not a Contractor."
Electrical Insights	Mark Hunter	mhunter@electrical-insights.com	"We were unable to fit it into our bid schedule based on prior RFQ's in front of this one. Not enough resources on our end."
Rotor Electric Co.	Benjamin Rosenberg	BRosenberg@rotorelectric.com	"This project is a design project, not a construction project. We are not a design consultant"
Kerr Pump & Supply	Joe Ash	joeash@kerrpump.com	"Kerr is a supplier of pumps in the state of Michigan. We are in the business of reviewing project plans and specifications only to find out if we represent the best pump for the job. If yes, we will seek out the contractors who plan to bid and get our pump proposal to them."
Applied Science, Inc.	John Michalski	jmichalski@asi-detroit.com	"We did not have the minimum requirements to lead a team and were not able to get on a team as a subconsultant."
Kokosing Industrial	Chad Lampe	crl@kokosing.biz	"We elected not to submit a proposal for this project upon considering other prior commitments to ongoing project pursuits. We appreciate our relationship with GLWA, and we look forward to responding to other current and future project opportunities."



Procurement Form (FOR)

Effective Date:
5/1/2019

Document #:
FSA_PRO_FOR_0041

Revision Date:
N/A

Revision#:
0

Document Title:
Vendor Response Follow-up

Document Owner/Department:
Procurement Team

Contract No. 2202790
Date: 12/6/2022

De-Cal, Inc.	Tom Cottrell	tcottrell@de-cal.com	“Bid was for engineering services. De-Cal is a mechanical contractor. Question was asked at pre-bid meeting and was confirmed as engineering services only by GLWA representative.”
Waterworks System & Equipment	Chuck Kronk	ckronk@waterworksystems.com	“We did not submit a proposal for this project as we are equipment suppliers and not consultants or contractors.”
KSB	Richard Quinn	Richard.Quinn@KSB.com	<p>“After reviewing the specifications, we chose not to bid this project because there was written a “sole sourced” pump which appears to be the preference for the GLWA. Unless we are able to talk to your engineers or consultants at the time of design about other types of sludge pumps (such as we offer), it would be a waste our time and effort to submit a proposal.”</p> <p>GLWA Project Manager response: “Project is for design services and not to procure pumps. Once we get the design completed, we will issue a RFB to get a contractor that will provide the pumps”.</p>
FH Paschen	Ken Swartz	kswartz@fhpaschen.com	“We did not respond to this RFP because the solicitation was seeking an engineer. We are a contractor, not an engineer. That is why we did not respond.”
HESCO	Heather Walker	Heather.walker@hesco-mi.com	“We are a manufacturer’s rep firm. We quoted equipment directly to the contractors, who submitted bids to GLWA.”
HDR	James Scholl	James.Scholl@hdrinc.com	“HDR does not perform construction, therefore we did not prepare a submittal.”
LGC Global	Jignesh Madhani	Jignesh.madhani@lgccorp.com	“Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) Improvements to the Sludge Feed Pumps at Dewatering Facilities is a design phase project. GLWA requested RFP to the Engineers only”
PCI Vetrix	Hassan Ajami	hajami@pci-vetrix.com	“We evaluated this project as a subcontractor and did not bid as prime.”
Burns & McDonnell	Stephen Boden	sboden@burnsmcd.com	“Project wasn’t a good fit for the resources that we had available at the time.”
Clark Construction Co.	Colt Odeh	codeh@clarkcc.com	“Solicitation is geared for engineering design services, and not



Procurement Form (FOR)

Effective Date:
5/1/2019

Document #:
FSA_PRO_FOR_0041

Revision Date:
N/A

Revision#:
0

Document Title:
Vendor Response Follow-up

Document Owner/Department:
Procurement Team

Contract No. 2202790
Date: 12/6/2022

			construction.”
Arcadis	Tom Armstrong	Thomas.Armstrong@arcadis.com	“We carefully evaluate each GLWA opportunity to confirm that the project best fits Arcadis’ capabilities and resources to complete the project to GLWA’s satisfaction. The scope of this project increased significantly from the CIP description. The bid period did not allow us enough time to evaluate this larger scope and prepare a plan of action that would meet all of GLWA’s goals for this project. Based on our thorough review, we determined that other firms were better positioned for this pursuit and decided to focus on other current pursuits which we feel that we’re better prepared to provide the desired outcomes that GLWA would expect.”
Wade Trim	April Mack	amack@wadetrim.com	“Wade Trim routinely downloads GLWA RFPs from Bonfire to evaluate opportunities to pursue. We did not feel this project was a good match for our firm at this time.”
Hazen and Sawyer	Tiffany Nation	tnation@hazenandsawyer.com	“At the time of RFP release, Hazen was focused on other GLWA deliverables and commitments.”