



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./Title: RFP-2004735, Design/Build Contract for Incineration Complex Fire Repairs
Date: 3/11/2021

Vendor	Contact Name	Email Address	Explanation of No Bid Submittal
Applied Science Inc	Karen Ridgway	appliedscience@asi-detroit.com	The work scope in the RFP is not work that ASI routinely performs.
Arcadis of Michigan LLC	Mike Halwani	mike.halwani@arcadis.com	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arcadis is fully capable and familiar with the facility to performing this work . - GLWA RFP requirements typically needs lot of effort and time to prepare proposal response. We carefully evaluate each opportunity to confirm project best fit and resources needed. . - For this proposal , ARCADIS' Management decided to focus on our current GLWA workload and continue to track future opportunities.
Barton Malow Company	Greg Svabik	greg.svabik@bmco.com	<p>Barton Malow Company (BMC) met with two different design firms related to this project, but found little interest in their desire to pursue this.</p> <p>BMC was also reluctant to develop a proposal for RFP-2004735 due to the delivery method – that being a design/build. Our firm always does well with GLWA D/B proposals, but with the amount of effort required for these, several design firms and BMC believe that the potential of being</p>



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./Title: RFP-2004735, Design/Build Contract for Incineration Complex Fire Repairs
Date: 3/11/2021

			awarded a smaller project, exceeds the costs and time associated with producing a D/B proposal.
Belfor Property Restoration	Audrey White	audrey.white@us.belfor.com	Our legal team had too many red lines on the RFP. So right out of the box we would have had to negotiate terms. I know that there are other contractors that would put in a bid without all the red lines. So we did not want to waste your time.
Black & Veatch Ltd. of Michigan	David Koch	kochds@bv.com	We are on GLWA's advisory side on this project, having developed the technical documents for the RFP, and thus conflicted out in bidding.
Brix Corporation	Marvin Hamdan	mhamdan@brixcorporation.com	Our estimating team were occupied with multiple projects during the bid time of the project.
Corrosion Prevention & Environmental Services	Blaine Pike	cpesblaine@gmail.com	The main reason for not bidding this project is we are not a design/build general contractor. We specialize in epoxy coatings and linings as a subcontractor. It is not in our normal scope of work.
Emerson Power & Water	Raymond Card	Raymond.Card@emerson.com	Emerson reviewed the specification and did not see a scope for work for us to provide a subcontractor proposal on.
GHD	Daniel Schechter	Daniel.Schechter@ghd.com	GHD reviewed the RFP for the Incineration Complex Fire Repairs. We determined that



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./Title: RFP-2004735, Design/Build Contract for Incineration Complex Fire Repairs
Date: 3/11/2021

			there was limited engineering effort on this project and therefore did not submit a proposal.
Greeley and Hansen LLC	Sahr Sweiss	marketing2@greeley-hansen.com	Greeley and Hansen was very interested in the Incineration Complex Fire Repairs design-build opportunity; the type of work is well within our capabilities. However, as a professional services firm, we would have had to team with or sub to a general contractor for design-build work. We discussed teaming for this project with those contractors who we thought might be a good fit for the project. Unfortunately, the timing of the solicitation limited their ability to respond in an effective manner.
Ideal Contracting	Daniel Budnik	dbudnik@idealcontracting.com	Ideal Contracting downloaded the documents to review the scope of the project. Upon the review of the scope and complexity of the project Ideal Contracting determined that we did not have adequate resources available to develop a proposal.
NTH Consultants, Ltd.	Lisa Dilg	ldilg@nthconsultants.com	We did evaluate this RFP and determined that there was no scope of work that matched work that matched our expertise, therefore we did not submit a proposal.
OHM Advisors	Erin Valmont	erin.valmont@ohm-advisors.com	We reviewed the RFP and based on follow-up with GLWA understood that we had a



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./Title: RFP-2004735, Design/Build Contract for Incineration Complex Fire Repairs
Date: 3/11/2021

			conflict of interest, since we were involved with developing the preliminary design documents.
Rotor Electric Company of Michigan, LLC	Benjamin Rosenberg	brosenberg@rotorelectric.com	Rotor Electric submitted pricing as a subcontractor to General Contractors to be used in their bid.
SDG Associates, LLC	Wesley Sims	wsims@sdg-assoc.com	SDG provides only design services, and itself is not able to respond as a prime to a design-build rfp. We partnered with a contractor who specialized in large scale fire restoration, who ultimately was not able to pursue after review from their centralized function. We talked to a couple of other contractors who were not interested.
Spence Brothers	Wayne Hofmann	bids@spencebrothers.com	After review & consideration, we felt it was more of a fire restoration specialty type of project. Spence Brothers does not specialize in this type of work. Fire restoration contractors, can usually be more cost-effective for self-performed trade work that requires specific expertise, training, certifications, etc. for this type of project.
STEVENS Engineers & Constructors	Cartrisa Curry	ccurry@stevenssec.com	After review of the attached solicitation, we discovered that the conveyor systems were already awarded under contract GLWA-CON-197 Modifications to Incinerator Sludge Feed System back in October 2020



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./Title: RFP-2004735, Design/Build Contract for Incineration Complex Fire Repairs
Date: 3/11/2021

			The remainder of the scope requested we would not be able to accommodate based upon the timing required and our upcoming workload
The Sherwin-Williams Company	Bob Horton	robert.j.horton@sherwin.com	Sherwin-Williams is a paint & coatings supplier and not a contractor. I did quote this job with several of the Painting Contractors that bid the project.
Wade Trim Associates	April Mack	amack@wadetrim.com	After reviewing the scope of work, Wade Trim did not feel there was adequate engineering services included in this contract. We were also currently focused on other GLWA opportunities and decided not to submit on this RFP.
Walsh Group	Firas Joseph	fjoseph@walshgroup.com	<p>Unfortunately Walsh was not able to turn in a proposal for the above referenced project due to timing of the bid and scope of work, Walsh have committed to bid other jobs prior to the advertisement of this project that used our available resources at the time.</p> <p>We look forward to submitting proposals and serving GLWA in upcoming pursuits, but unfortunately we were limited by our resources for this one and did not want to</p>



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./Title: RFP-2004735, Design/Build Contract for Incineration Complex Fire Repairs
Date: 3/11/2021

			submit a proposal that will not benefit GLWA.
Weiss Construction Co., LLC	Joe Mulville	jmulville@weiss-construction.com	Project scope was more suited to a commercial building general contractor like CC or LGC so we elected to pass.