



# STATE OF MICHIGAN ENTERPRISE PROCUREMENT

Department of Technology Management & Budget  
525 W. Allegan Street, PO Box 30026, Lansing, MI 48909

## Recommendation of Award

RFP 171-23000001926

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of **RFP # 171-23000001926 for MDOC monitoring solutions** and has recommended an award to **Alcohol Monitoring Systems, Inc. in the amount not to exceed \$7,454,843.75** for alcohol monitoring services and an award to **Allied Universal Electronic Monitoring US, Inc. in the amount not to exceed \$8,174,512.50** for GPS & curfew monitoring services, pending State Administrative Board approval. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#). The term of each contract is five base years with five additional optional renewal years.

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:

Jarrod Barron, Solicitation Manager  
Barronj1@michigan.gov  
517-284-7045

### Respondents/Bidders

The RFP was posted on SIGMA on 4/19/2023. The following companies submitted a response by the published due date of 5/24/2023:

Respondent/Bidder	Address City, State Zip	SDVOB*	Responsive Proposal
Alcohol Monitoring Systems, Inc	1241 W. Mineral Avenue, Littleton, CO 80120	No	Yes
Allied Universal Electronic Monitoring US, Inc	1838 Gunn Hwy., Odessa, FL 33556	No	Yes
Buddi US, LLC	1964 Bayshore Blvd., Suite B, Dunedin FL 34698	No	Yes

\*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

# Evaluation Synopsis

## I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it can 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.

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
<b>Project Scope</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-16 and 21-24</li> <li>Schedule D – Service Level Agreement</li> <li>Schedule E – Data Security Requirements</li> <li>Schedule F – Disaster Recovery Plan</li> <li>Schedule G – Transition In/Out Plan</li> <li>Schedule H – Hardware</li> <li>Schedule I – System Acceptance Testing</li> </ul>	30
<b>Solution Requirements / Specifications</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet</li> </ul>	40
<b>Staffing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 17-20</li> <li>Attachment 1, Resume Templates</li> </ul>	15
<b>Company Background</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vendor Questions Worksheet</li> </ul>	15
<b>Total Weight</b>	<b>100</b>

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

## II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Jarrod Barron, DTMB Jason Boyl, DTMB William Dunham, MDOC Don Matson, MDOC	Michael Bowker, MDOC Marisha Curtis, DTMB David Enslin, DTMB Kami Harris, MDOC Christopher Hopcraft, MDOC Kristin Kilpela, DTMB Mary Knapp, DTMB Tara Lapham, MDOC Eric Miller, DTMB Kristine Mills, DTMB Quenton Pannell, MDOC Jessica Reuschel, MDOC Autumn Ross, MDOC Patrick Russell, DTMB Ranjana Sharma, DTMB Jyothi Suresh, DTMB Sahil Tandon, DTMB Christopher Troub, MDOC Sarah Valade, MDOC Andrew Zeeman, MDOC

### III. Evaluation Results

The JEC determined that each of the three proposals met the minimum 80 technical evaluation point threshold. The JEC derived the technical scores below from the bidders' written proposals:

#### DEDUCTIONS SUMMARY

Criteria	AMS	ALLIED	BUDDI
<b>Project Scope</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-16 and 21-24</li> <li>• Schedule D – Service Level Agreement</li> <li>• Schedule E – Data Security Requirements</li> <li>• Schedule F – Disaster Recovery Plan</li> <li>• Schedule G – Transition In/Out Plan</li> <li>• Schedule H – Hardware</li> <li>• Schedule I – System Acceptance Testing</li> </ul>	-1	-1	-1
<b>Solution Requirements / Specifications</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet</li> </ul>	-2	-2	-1
<b>Staffing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 17-20</li> <li>• Attachment 1, Resume Templates</li> </ul>	-2	-2	-1
<b>Company Background</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vendor Questions Worksheet</li> </ul>	0	0	-1
<b>Total Technical Evaluation Deductions</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>-4</b>
<b>Technical Evaluation Score</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>

#### EVALUATION SCORING BREAKDOWN

Project Scope				
PROPOSAL SECTION	Description	AMS	ALLIED	BUDDI
SOW Sec 6. User Type and Capacity	Failed to clearly state whether the system which is being proposed will meet requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.		-1	
Schedule D - SLA	Failed to agree to State's SLA without exceptions.			-1
Schedule G – Transition Out Plan	Failed to provide detailed transition-out plan	-1		
	<b>Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-1</b>
Solution Requirements / Specifications				
SPECIFICATIONS SECTION	Description	AMS	ALLIED	BUDDI
24.1	No: exceeds 5 ounces.	-1		
25.9	Incomplete response: No "Yes/No" or "A-E" response.	-1		
3.5	Column C		-1	
12.5	Column D		-1	
1.21	Column C			-1
	<b>Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-1</b>
Staffing				
PROPOSAL SECTION	Description	AMS	ALLIED	BUDDI
Project Manager Resume	Proposed resource does not possess requested certification	-1	-1	
Security Officer Resume	Proposed resource does not possess requested certification	-1	-1	
Security Officer Resume	Failed to provide the years in which proposed resource obtained requested skills and experience.			-1
	<b>Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-1</b>
Background and Experience				
VENDOR QUESTIONS WORKSHEET SECTION	Description	AMS	ALLIED	BUDDI
Gross Annual Sales	Failed to clearly state whether receiving a contract under this RFP will increase your gross revenue by more than 25% from last year's sales.			-1
	<b>Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1</b>

**VI. Oral Presentations & Pricing**

Oral presentations were conducted, and pricing was evaluated. The following is the projected 5-year cost summary of the proposals that passed technical evaluation:

GPS & Curfew Monitoring

	<b>AMS State-Owned</b>	<b>AMS Lease</b>	<b>ALLIED State-Owned</b>	<b>ALLIED Lease</b>	<b>BUDDI State-Owned</b>	<b>BUDDI Lease</b>
Year 1	\$4,840,812.50	\$3,423,437.50	\$1,634,902.50	\$4,380,000.00	\$6,474,362.50	\$4,353,412.50
Year 2	\$3,115,812.50	\$3,423,437.50	\$1,634,902.50	\$4,380,478.00	\$3,103,112.50	\$4,353,412.50
Year 3	\$3,115,812.50	\$3,423,437.50	\$1,634,902.50	\$4,380,956.00	\$3,103,112.50	\$4,353,412.50
Year 4	\$3,115,812.50	\$3,423,437.50	\$1,634,902.50	\$4,381,434.00	\$3,103,112.50	\$4,353,412.50
Year 5	\$3,115,812.50	\$3,423,437.50	\$1,634,902.50	\$4,381,912.00	\$3,103,112.50	\$4,353,412.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$17,304,062.50</b>	<b>\$17,117,187.50</b>	<b>\$8,174,512.50</b>	<b>\$21,904,780.00</b>	<b>\$18,886,812.50</b>	<b>\$21,767,062.50</b>

Alcohol Monitoring

	<b>AMS State-Owned</b>	<b>AMS Lease</b>	<b>ALLIED State-Owned</b>	<b>ALLIED Lease</b>	<b>BUDDI State-Owned</b>	<b>BUDDI Lease</b>
Year 1	\$1,477,968.75	\$2,078,218.75	No Bid	No Bid	\$2,872,820.00	\$2,187,718.75
Year 2	\$1,477,968.75	\$2,078,218.75	No Bid	No Bid	\$1,522,820.00	\$2,187,718.75
Year 3	\$1,477,968.75	\$2,078,218.75	No Bid	No Bid	\$1,522,820.00	\$2,187,718.75
Year 4	\$1,510,468.75	\$2,078,218.75	No Bid	No Bid	\$1,522,820.00	\$2,187,718.75
Year 5	\$1,510,468.75	\$2,078,218.75	No Bid	No Bid	\$1,522,820.00	\$2,187,718.75
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$7,454,843.75</b>	<b>\$10,391,093.75</b>	<b>No Bid</b>	<b>No Bid</b>	<b>\$8,964,100.00</b>	<b>\$10,938,593.75</b>

**VII. Award Recommendation**

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of factors stated in Technical Evaluation Criteria of the RFP and price. The JEC has determined that the following will provide the best value to the State and recommends an award to **Alcohol Monitoring Systems, Inc. in the amount not to exceed \$7,454,843.75** for alcohol monitoring services and an award to **Allied Universal Electronic Monitoring US, Inc. in the amount not to exceed \$8,174,512.50** for GPS & curfew monitoring services, pending State Administrative Board approval.