

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000906

The Department of Technology, Management, and Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000002211 for Pipette Preventative Maintenance Program Services and has recommended an award to Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC in the amount of \$450,000.00, 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:

Katie McFarland, Solicitation Manager.
 McFarlandK1@michigan.gov

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Pipette Preventative Maintenance Program Services. The term of this contract is four years, with up to six, additional one-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on May 10, for 4 weeks The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of June 7, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC	7500 Edgewater Drive, Oakland, CA 94621	No	No
Cenmed Enterprises	121 Jersey Avenue New Brunswick, NJ 08901	No	No

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Michigan Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

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.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-2	40
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 3	10
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-9	25
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	25
	Total	100

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
Katie McFarland, Category Specialist DTMB, Central Procurement Services	Wanda Rademacher, Buyer MDHHS, Bureau of Grants and Purchasing
Keri Fisher, State Administrative Manager MDHHS, Bureau of Laboratories	
Mary Bonifas, State Administrative Manager MDHHS, Bureau of Laboratories	
Terri Kuhn, Quality Assurance Officer EGLE, Laboratory Services	

III. Evaluation Results

A. Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC based on a score of 90, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-2: 40 Points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 3: 10 Points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-9: 15 Points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. 4.1 and 4.2: The Bidder did not agree to fixed pricing for 365-day period and instead offered an 18% off the list price with providing the State a 30-day notice of any price changes.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 25 Points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 90/100

B. Cenmed Enterprises

The Evaluation Team determined that Cenmed Enterprises based on a score of 72, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-2: 27 Points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. Question 1, the Bidder failed to provide their ISO 17025 certificate required and did not answer how they ensure traceability to ISO 17025.
- b. Question 2, the Bidder did not provide any additional accreditations related to the scope of this RFP and failed to answer how they ensure traceability.
- c. Question 3, the Bidder did not explain their ability to provide calibration services or preventative maintenance services aside from indicating they have trained engineers.
- d. Question 4, the Bidder indicated tips are not required for mail in repair services. However, there is a concern on how the pipette would be properly calibrated if the tip was not provided.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 3: 2 Points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. Question 3.5, the Bidder is subcontracting 100% of the work to Yalist Labs LLC.
- b. Question 3.6, the Bidder failed to explain how it intends to ensure the security of State facilities, whether they use uniforms and/or ID badges, identify the company that will perform background checks if required, or the scope of those background checks. They only acknowledged the requirement.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-9: 23 Points

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

- a. Question 8.5, The Bidder had conflicting answers for Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). There is a concern on if the Bidder would or would not use products containing PFAS due to possible cross contamination.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20 Points

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

- a. Question 6, the Bidder indicated they agreed to the Standard Contract Terms, but then attached their own terms and conditions which conflict with the State’s terms.

Total Score: 72/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC	Cenmed Enterprises
1	Schedule A - SOW - Sections 1-2	40	27
2	Schedule A - SOW - Section 3	10	2
3	Schedule A - SOW - Sections 4-9	15	23
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet	25	20
	Total	90	72

V. Pricing Summary

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

Deliverable		Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC
ISO Certification		
1	1-channel pipette PM	\$96.43
2	8-channel pipette PM	\$291.92
3	12-channel pipette PM	\$327.18
4	Trip Charge (including mileage, etc.)	\$170.00
Traceable to NIST without ISO Certification		
1	1-channel pipette PM	\$49.53
2	8-channel pipette PM	\$152.52

Deliverable		Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC
ISO Certification		
3	12-channel pipette PM	\$186.14
4	Trip Charge (including mileage, etc.)	\$170.00
Deliverable		Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC
Purchase of new pipettes (optional)		
1	1-channel pipette	\$554.00
2	8-channel pipette	\$1,265.00 - \$1,675.00
3	12-channel pipette	\$1,585.00 - \$2,380.00

VI. Clarifications

The following clarification question was asked to which a response was received clarifying what may or may not be included:

- 1) For repair services, the State requested if only seal and O-ring replacement was completed on-site, or if any additional repairs would require off-site repair.

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 the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include meeting all requirements of the RFP and providing the best price.

Award Recommendation is made to Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC in the amount of \$450,000.00.