

Recommendation of Award

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000018

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP # 210000000535, Truck Bodies, Seasonal Maintenance Equipment, & Upfitting Services, and has recommended a multiple award to Cimline, Inc., Henderson Products, Monroe Truck Equipment, Inc., Spaulding Mfg., Inc., Cives Corporation, and Warren, Inc. pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State's rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Yvon Dufour, Solicitation Manager
 dufoury@michigan.gov
 (517) 249-0455

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor(s) to provide Truck Bodies, Seasonal Maintenance Equipment, & Upfitting Services. The term of this contract is three (3) years, with up to two (2), one (1) year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on www.michigan.gov/SIGMAVSS on 1/4/2023 for one hundred and thirteen (113) days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 4/27/2023.

| Bidder | Address, City, State, Zip Code | SDVOB* | GDBE** |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------|--------|
| ABCO Services | 6923 Summerfield Rd. Petersburg, MI 49270 | No | No |
| Cimline, Inc. | 2601 Niagara Lane N., Plymouth, MN 55447 | No | No |
| Henderson Products | 1085 S. Third St. Manchester, IA 52057 | No | No |
| Monroe Truck Equipment, Inc. | 1051 West 7 th Street – Monroe, WI 53566 | No | No |
| National Highway Maintenance System | P.O. Box 5315, Akron, OH 44334 | No | No |
| Spaulding Mfg, Inc. | 5366 East Rd, Saginaw, Mi 48601 | No | No |
| Versalift Midwest LLC | 51761 Danview Tech., Shelby Twp., MI 48315 | No | No |
| Cives Corporation | 3700 Mansell Road, Suite 500 Alpharetta, GA 30022 | No | No |
| Warren, Inc. | 707 North Fir Ave Collins, MS 39428 | No | No |

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

Evaluation Synopsis

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Phase 1 – Mandatory Minimum Requirements: In the initial phase of the evaluation process, the Lead State will review all proposals timely received. Unacceptable proposals (non-responsive proposals not conforming to RFP requirements) will be eliminated from further consideration.

To avoid disqualification, the Bidder must provide documentation to support the following:

1. The Proposer must be a manufacturer, or a Supplier authorized by the manufacturer to distribute the products they are offering. (Pass/Fail)

2. The Proposer must agree, if awarded a contract, that all “catalog” pricing must be published and available at all times via website access, and/or electronic/printed price pages. (Pass/Fail)

Phase 2: Technical Proposal Evaluation (100 points)

| <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> (NOTE: The Lead State and NASPO reserve the right to use related Bidder responses from other sections of the RFP that are applicable to each section below) | <u>Possible Points</u> |
|---|------------------------|
| Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: <i>Attachment B - Section B1. Scope & Function. (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately)</i> | 40 pts |
| Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: <i>Attachment B - Section B4. General Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11</i> | 15 pts |
| Agreement with Lead State Terms and Conditions in Attachment F <i>Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9</i> | 15 pts |
| Qualification and Expertise of Staff: <i>Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3 and 4</i> | 15 pts |
| References: <i>Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8</i> | 15 pts |
| Total Technical Points | 100 pts |

Proposals receiving **80** or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award. See **Attachment D – RFP Evaluation Scoresheet**.

The Lead State may utilize all Bidder information, without regard to a proposal’s technical score, to determine fair market value for goods or services sought. The Lead State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal. If applicable, the Lead State’s evaluation will include consideration of a Bidder’s qualified disabled veterans/service-disabled veteran owned business(QDV/SDVOB) status under MCL 18.1261(8). Additional information on the SDVOB preference is available at: Michigan.gov/SDVOB.

The Lead State strongly encourages strict adherence to the Lead State Terms and Conditions. The Lead State reserves the right to deem a bid non-responsive for failure to accept the Lead State Terms and Conditions. Nevertheless, the Bidder may submit proposed changes to the Lead State Terms and Conditions in track changes (i.e., visible edits) with an explanation of the Bidder’s need for each proposed change. Failure to include track changes with an explanation of the Bidder’s need for the proposed change constitutes the Bidder’s acceptance of the Lead State Terms and Conditions. General statements, such as that the Bidder reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions, may be considered non-responsive.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by the NASPO Sourcing Team, which consisted of the following individuals:

| Voting | Advisory |
|---|--|
| Yvon Dufour, Category Specialist, DTMB Central Procurement, State of Michigan | Katie Hines, Cooperative Portfolio Coordinator, National Association of State Procurement Officials, Lexington, KY |
| Robert T. Mitchell, Purchasing Agent IV @ Equipment Specialist, Center for Procurement and Contract Services, State of Colorado | |
| Lauren Spatzierath, Procurement Operations Manager, State Financial Services Division, Department of Administration, State of Montana | |
| DeAna Reed-Sharpe, Procurement Manager, Office of State Procurement, State of South Carolina | |
| Scott Nelson, Purchasing Specialist, Office of Procurement Management, State of South Dakota | |
| Jamie Bostyan, Purchasing Agent, Department of Transportation, State of North Dakota | |

III. Evaluation Results

Step 1 - Mandatory Minimums

| Bidder | Meets | Deficiency |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| ABCO Services | YES | NA |
| Cimline, Inc. | YES | NA |
| Henderson Products | YES | NA |
| Monroe Truck Equipment, Inc. | YES | NA |
| National Highway Maintenance System | YES | NA |
| Spaulding Mfg., Inc. | YES | NA |
| Versalift Midwest LLC | YES | NA |
| Cives Corporation | YES | NA |
| Warren, Inc. | YES | NA |

Step 2 – Technical Evaluation

A. ABCO Services (ABCO)

The Evaluation Team determined that ABCO, based on a score of 78/100, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - Section B1. Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 24/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B1.1, B1.2, B1.4, B1.5, and B1.6.

- 2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 9/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of section B4.2 and B4.10.

- 3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

- 4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

- 5. References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 78/100

B. Cimline, Inc. (Cimline)

The Evaluation Team determined that Cimline, based on a score of 97/100 (B1), 97/100 (B2), and 97/100 (B3), did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B1.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not provide all information requested for Experience #1, #2, and #3.

Total Score: 97/100

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B2.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not provide all information requested for Experience #1, #2, and #3.

Total Score: 97/100

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B3.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not provide all information requested for Experience #1, #2, and #3.

Total Score: 97/100

C. Henderson Products (Henderson)

The Evaluation Team determined that Henderson, based on a score of 100/100 (B1), and 100/100 (B3), did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B1.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B3**. Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

D. Monroe Truck Equipment (Monroe)

The Evaluation Team determined that Monroe, based on a score of 81/100 (B1), and 97/100 (B3), did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B1**. Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 24/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B1.1, B1.2, B1.4, B1.5, and B1.6.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, B4.10, and B4.14.

3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 81/100

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B3.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, B4.10, and B4.14.

4. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

6. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 97/100

E. National Highway Maintenance System (NHMS)

The Evaluation Team determined that NHMS based on a score of 77/100 (B1), 97/100 (B2), and 97/100 (B3), did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B1.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 20/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B1.1, B1.2, B1.4, B1.5, and B1.6.

2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, B4.10, and B4.14.

3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 77/100

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B2.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, B4.10, and B4.14.

3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 97/100

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B3.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, B4.10, and B4.14.

4. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

6. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 97/100

F. Spaulding Manufacturing (Spaulding)

The Evaluation Team determined that Spaulding, based on a score of 92/100 (B1), and 100/100 (B3), did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B1.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 32/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections, B1.4.

2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, B4.10, and B4.14.

3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 92/100

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B3.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

G. Versa-Lift Midwest (Versa-Lift)

The Evaluation Team determined that Versa-Lift, based on a score of 75/100 (B1), and 91/100 (B3), did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B1.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 24/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B1.1, B1.2, B1.4, B1.5, and B1.6.

2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities: Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 12/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, and B4.14.

3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 9/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Bidder has exceptions to Standard Contract Terms.

4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 75/100

1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work: – Attachment B - **Section B3.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 12/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Bidder did not describe how they comply with the requirements of sections B4.2, B4.10, and B4.14.
3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 9/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Bidder has exceptions to Standard Contract Terms.
4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 91/100

H. Cives Corporation (Cives)

The Evaluation Team determined that Cives, based on a score of 100/100 (B1), and 100/100 (B3), did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B1.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B3.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

I. Warren Inc. (Warren)

The Evaluation Team determined that Warren, based on a score of 100/100 (B1), and 100/100 (B3), did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B1.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
3. **Agreement with Standard Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
4. **Qualification and Expertise of Staff:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
5. **References:** Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

1. **Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work:** – Attachment B - **Section B3.** Scope & Function (If applicable, section B2. and B3. shall be scored separately) SCORE 40/40
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
2. **Demonstrated Technical Capabilities:** Attachment B - Section B4. General. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 1, 2, 5, 5.1, 7, and 11 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 9. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 3, 4 SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. References: Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 8. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Evaluation Including Section B.1 for Purchase

| | Weight | ABCO | Cimline | Henderson | Monroe | NHMS | Spaulding | Versa-Lift | Cives | Warren |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| 1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work | 40 | 24 | 40 | 40 | 24 | 20 | 32 | 24 | 40 | 40 |
| 2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities | 15 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| 3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 15 |
| 4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff | 15 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| 5. References | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Total: | 100 | 78 | 97 | 100 | 81 | 77 | 92 | 75 | 100 | 100 |

Evaluation Including Section B.2 for Rental

| | Weight | ABCO | Cimline | Henderson | Monroe | NHMS | Spaulding | Versa-Lift | Cives | Warren |
|---|--------|------|---------|-----------|--------|------|-----------|------------|-------|--------|
| 1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work | 40 | | 40 | | | 40 | | | | |
| 2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities | 15 | | 15 | | | 12 | | | | |
| 3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms | 15 | | 15 | | | 15 | | | | |
| 4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff | 15 | | 12 | | | 15 | | | | |
| 5. References | 15 | | 15 | | | 15 | | | | |
| (* No Bid) Total: | 100 | NB | 97 | NB | NB | 97 | NB | NB | NB | NB |

Evaluation Including Section B.3 for Parts, and Maintenance & Repair

| | Weight | ABCO | Cimline | Henderson | Monroe | NHMS | Spaulding | Versa-Lift | Cives | Warren |
|---|--------|------|---------|-----------|--------|------|-----------|------------|-------|--------|
| 1. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Statement of Work | 40 | | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| 2. Demonstrated Technical Capabilities | 15 | | 15 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| 3. Agreement with Standard Contract Terms | 15 | | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 15 |
| 4. Qualification and Expertise of Staff | 15 | | 12 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| 5. References | 15 | | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| (* No Bid) Total: | 100 | NB | 97 | 100 | 97 | 97 | 100 | 91 | 100 | 100 |

VI. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

UNIT PRICING

See attachment 1 to NASPO Upfitting Synapsis

The following specifications were “no bids” for all the bidders who passed technical: 1 to 20, 24, 25, 27 to 34, 37 to 47, 49, and 63 to 75.

VII. Negotiations: Bidders with a passing technical score were asked to submit second round pricing. The following savings were met:

Warren, Inc. resubmitted new pricing for seven items. The discount resulted in 13.64% (potential savings of \$68,200.00). No other pricing was submitted.

VIII. Award Recommendation:

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan and NASPO. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Cimline, Henderson, Monroe, Spaulding, Cives, and Warren provide the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

1. Provides sales, warranty, parts, and maintenance & repair services.
2. Provides their services to all States and Territories of the USA.
3. Provides a broad scope of equipment.

The Buyer recommends that **Cimline, Henderson, Monroe, Spaulding, Cives, and Warren** be awarded a contract for Truck Bodies, Seasonal Maintenance Equipment, & Upfitting Services.

Funding for this contract shall be as follows:

*****Cimline** Award amount: \$1,000,000.00

*****Henderson** Award amount: \$500,000.00

*****Monroe** Award amount: \$10,000,000.00

*****Spaulding** Award amount: \$1,000,000.00

*****Cives** Award amount: \$500,000.00

*****Warren** Award amount: \$500,000.00

***Award amounts are based on State of Michigan Agencies current spend on similar contracts. Does not include MiDEAL members which includes local units of government, school districts, universities, community colleges, and nonprofit hospitals.