GLWA Procurement			
Effective Date: 7/1/2024	**Document #:** FSA_PRO_TPL_0025	**Revision Date:** N/A	**Revision#:** 0
Document Title: Vendor Response Follow-up		**Document Owner/Department:** Procurement Team	

Contract No. 2401015/Design Build for 96-Inch Water Transmission Main Relocation Phase 3
Date: 1/23/2025

Vendor	Contact Name	Email Address	Explanation of No Bid Submittal
Brown and Caldwell, LLC	David Nitz	dnitz@BrwnCald.com	Brown and Caldwell, LLC submitted as a design partner/subcontractor with the Clark/Ric-Man JV Proposal.
AECOM Great Lakes, Inc	Robert Green	Bob.Green@aecom.com	AECOM had not positioned ourselves with a suitable contractor to provide the best project execution for GLWA.
Carollo Engineers, Inc.	Michael Van Antwerp	MVanAntwerp@carollo.com	Carollo thought the project was an exciting challenge, but we were unable to identify a suitable Design-Build partner for the pursuit.
Geo-Cell Solutions, Inc.	Tarin Winton	tmwinton@sbcglobal.net	Geo-Cell Solutions is not a design firm. We are a subcontractor.
GEI Consultants of Michigan, P.C	Michael C. Gentner	mgentner@geiconsultants.com	We did not intend to submit as a prime. We were plan holders for our support of prime teams proposing.
American Cast Iron Pipe Company	Caelan March	cmarch@american-usa.com	As a manufacturer specializing in ductile iron and spiral-weld steel pipes, we are unable to address the full scope of the project requirements.

Benesch	Chris Carr	CCarr@benesch.com	We were unable to establish a teaming agreement with a contractor and cost associated with pursuing a project that does not pay a stipend for the proposal cost could not be justified.
Harrington Industrial Plastics	Frank Jaehnig	fjaehnig@hipco.com	We are a distributor of specialty piping products and would not bid a project directly like that.
Brierley Associates	Steven M. Vinci	svinci@brierleyassociates.com	Brierley Associates is a specialty geostructural/tunnel and trenchless design firm and not contractor. However, we do work with many of the regional contractors, as a subconsultant, who pursue projects like this. Since we fill a subconsultant role, we would not be submitting as a prime.
LGC Global	Karen Haydett	karen.haydett@lgccorp.com	There was not enough time for LGC to assemble a bid for this complex project. We requested that GLWA extend the bid due date, but the response was NO. Hence, we decided NOT to submit a bid.
JETT Pump and Valve, L.L.C.	Jennifer Greene	jgreene@jettpump.com	JETT provided a proposal to contractors (De-Cal and Ric-Man).
Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.	Janice Strine	JStrine@hrcengr.com	HRCs 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.
PCI Vetrix	Hassan Ajami	hajami@pci-vetrix.com	We submitted as a subcontractor to the electrical firms. This is not a project scope we could perform directly.

Pre-Construction Media	Nandish Doshi	dish@preconstructionmedia.com	We are just a subcontractor that provides Above Ground Audio/Video for Projects.
Project Amazing	Bill Hunter	wmhunter02@aol.com	I represent equipment suppliers who sell their goods to the various contractors. We do not bid construction projects direct.
Mokveld USA	Mina Georgy	Mina.Georgy@mokveld.com	We are a valve manufacturer only and we couldn't bid the whole project scope since it involves many items that are not within our products range.
Rotor Electric Company of Michigan, LLC	Benjamin Rosenberg	brosenberg@rotorelectric.com	First, the nature of the project is such that it is not in the area of Rotor Electric Company of Michigan's expertise to take the lead and performing the bulk of the work. Second, Rotor Electric Company of Michigan is engaged with the purpose (Clark/Ric-Man) as the Electrical Subcontractor on the project and did submit to them for the electrical portion of the project.
Temoney Banks Consulting, LLC	Nicole Banks	info@temoneybanksconsulting.com	Our organization is more of a subcontractor than a Prime submitting for the entire project. We provide Project Management, Project Controls (cost & schedule), Change management, subcontractor & vendor management, auditing of Payment Applications, IT Strategy & Acquisition Support.

TRC Companies	Shirlene Davis	Davis, Shirlene Shirlene.Davis@trccompanies.com	Not enough time to submit proposal.
Z Contractors, Inc.	Blake Zapczynski	bzap@z-contractors.com	This project did not fit with our current workload.
Wm Floyd Company	Jason Axelson	jaxelson@wmfloyd.net	Wm Floyd Co. is a mechanical contractor. Our current contributions for the water/wastewater industry are primarily HVAC. We were in preliminary talks to quote the HVAC scope of work on this project; however, nothing further came of it.
NTH Consultants, Ltd.	Lisa Dilg	LDilg@nthconsultants.com	Based on the experience and expertise required for this work, we understand that only a few specialized contractors are capable of performing it. Unfortunately, while we were very interested in the consulting engineering scope, we couldn't secure the right construction teaming partners.
Jacobs	Jason Matteo	Jason.Matteo@jacobs.com	Jacobs is serving as the Owner's Agent to GLWA for this project; therefore, we were precluded from proposing on the Design-Build.
Kennedy Industries	Bryan Davidson	bdavidson@kennedyind.com	We did bid this but direct to a contractor as we are just a supplier.
Verdantas	Gregory Bushey	GBushey@verdantas.com	Verdantas (formerly CT Consultants) did not provide GLWA with a proposal because we were unable to assemble a team to prepare a competitive proposal.

RA Consultants	Tony Marconi	tmarconi@raconsultantsllc.com	RA Consultants (now Gonzalez Companies, LLC) joined the Clark Construction/Ric-Man Construction Joint Venture Team for this project This response is for RA Consultants and Gonzalez Companies.
Hamlett Engineering Sales Co DBA HESCO Group	Heather Walker	heather.walker@hesco-mi.com	HESCO was unable to submit a bid directly to GLWA as we are only a supplier.
*WSP Michigan, Inc.	James Rydquist	James.Rydquist@wsp.com	WSP was very interested in submitting on this work, and we collaborated with our same team that completed the 81-inch transmission main - waterworks park to NE, phase 2 project. Our contractor Dan's Excavating was leading the proposal efforts and we proceeded very far along into the process before being told by the Line-stop vendor we were talking with that they were going to agree to be Sole Source with the Ric-Man team. There are only 2 vendors for this type of work and the other vendor was not willing to agree to the liability terms that Dan's Excavating would need. In addition, Dan's Excavating found out that the Steel Pipe vendor also agreed to a sole-source agreement with Ric-Man. With the pricing of the work being important and part of the submittal and the difficulties working with the remaining line stop vendor, Dan's Excavating decided to No Go the work and as a team we would not move forward.

			****Please refer to the Procurement Note on pg. 9 of this survey.***
*LGC Global	Karen Haydett	karen.haydett@lgccorp.com	LGC Global assembled a team and endeavored to bid on RFP-2401015 Design Build for 96-inch Water Transmission Main Relocation Phase. As you may know, the project scope was highly specialized as it required line stopping services. There are a limited number of qualified companies nationwide capable of performing this type of work. We contacted one reputable company and learned they had signed an exclusive teaming agreement with a competitor who was also bidding on this project. We continued our search and identified another qualified line-stopping company willing to provide pricing. Understandably, this company needed time to review and study the RFP documents. We promptly contacted GLWA Procurement staff on December 5, 2024, to request a 30-day extension of the bid due date (from December 17, 2024 to January 17, 2025). We were advised the next day our request was denied because it would affect the overall project schedule. Despite our best efforts, we were unable to provide a suitable, comprehensive bid by the deadline date. ****Please refer to the Procurement Note on pg. 9 of this survey.***

Wade Trim Associates	April Mack	amack@wadetrim.com	Wade Trim routinely downloads GLWA RFPs from Bonfire to evaluate opportunities to pursue. We reviewed the RFP and held multiple teaming conversations with a prime Contractor and engineering partners, however, the Contractor ultimately elected to not pursue this RFP due to the level of risk and lack of availability of the specialty subcontractors required to complete the scope of work.
Weiss Construction Co., LLC	Sherry Field	sfield@weissconstruction.com	Weiss Construction did not submit a proposal for RFP-2401015 because the project is not in our usual scope of work.
Corrosion Specialists	Dan Mankivsky	danm@corrosionspecialists.com	We are only a subcontractor.
*L. D'Agostini & Sons, Inc.	Michael D'Agostini	miked@ldagostini.com	L.D'Agostini & Sons would have liked to bid on the project but unfortunately there were a few factors that prohibited us from bidding or had the potential for a unknown liability that ultimately, we decided to not bid. The biggest of the factors is that there are only 1 or 2 contractors in the US that we are capable of doing the 96" Line stops. Of those two there is only one that would possibly provide a guarantee and bonding. We had contacted them, but another contractor, presumably Ric-Man Construction, already had them under an agreement that prohibited them from bidding to anyone else. This effectively eliminated anyone else

			from bidding on this project because without that contractor you wouldn't be able to do the job. We also take issue with the arbitrary methods used in GLWA's Post bid interviewing on past projects. We feel a more measurable method needs to be used if an interview process is going to be the method. ****Please refer to the Procurement Note on pg. 9 of this survey.***
Walsh Group	Joseph Firas	fjoseph@walshgroup.com	We did not bid the referenced project due to other opportunities we were pursuing and resources already committed. Walsh is better positioned in the market to pursue plant-based work vs. the transmission main or sewer main work.
Hach	Ben Scrace	Ben.Scrace@hach.com	Thank you for your email and I'm happy to provide an explanation as to why Hach did not provide a bid for the above reference project. Unless I completely misunderstood the scope of the project, this bid is for the design and construction of the 96" transmission line. Hach is an manufacturer of water quality analyzers and therefore would not submit a bid directly to GLWA as a engineer/contractor. Hach works with system integrations and engineering firms during the design stage ensuring the correct equipment is selected for application. In the case of this project there is a single chlorine analyzer with

			transmitter which most integrators and engineers shown on the sign-in sheets are familiar with.

***Procurement Note:**

1. There was one (1) time extension granted on this project. The project was advertised for 9 weeks. The second request for a time extension was denied. Phase I and II of the 96-Inch water transmission main were SRF funded. Per the project manager, the current P6 bid schedule from the Design Build team shows some of the critical design phase items being completed in January/February of 2026. These milestones are important to the procurement and establishment of the temporary pumping configuration that needs to be installed prior to October 2026 for testing during the low demand season. If these milestones are not achieved, it could push the overall schedule an entire year due to the seasonal constraints for our system connections. This will also drastically change forecasted FY spend. We need to try and keep as much float in the schedule to avoid any delays during the final design phase and implementation/testing of the temporary booster station. The final system connections cannot occur without the temporary station as the implementation plan describes.
2. Related to the issue of the vendor selected having sole agreements with subcontractors, none of the vendors interested in this project brought this to GLWA's attention during the solicitation period. GLWA had no knowledge of any sole agreement with the subcontractors until we received responses for this vendor survey.