

## Recommendation of Award

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000019

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP # 230000002703, Cab & Chassis Truck Dealers Prequalification, and has recommended a multiple award to D & K Truck Sales, Tri-County International, Lunghamer Ford of Owosso, Lafontaine CDJR, Lafontaine Buick GMC (Lansing), Lafontaine Chevrolet (Dexter), and Lafontaine Cadillac Buick GMC (Highland), 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 Prequalification of Cab & Chassis Truck Dealers. The term of this contract is five (5) years, with up to two (2), one (1) year renewal options.

### Bidders:

The RFP was posted on [www.michigan.gov/SIGMAVSS](http://www.michigan.gov/SIGMAVSS) on 7/27/2023 for forty-nine (49) days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 9/14/2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
D & K Truck Sales	3020 Snow Rd, Lansing MI 48917	No	No
Gorno Ford	22025 Allen Rd., Woodhaven, MI 48183	No	No
Tri-County International	5701 Wyoming Ave. Dearborn, MI 48126	No	No
Lunghamer Ford of Owosso	1960 East Main Street, Owosso, MI 48867	No	No
Todd Wentzel Chevrolet	3156 Highland Dr, PO Box 310 Hudsonville, MI 49426	No	No
Lafontaine CDJR	6131 S. Pennsylvania Ave. Lansing, MI 48911	No	No
Lafontaine Buick GMC	5901 S Pennsylvania, Lansing, MI 48911	No	No
Lafontaine Chevrolet	7120 Dexter Ann Arbor Rd, Dexter, MI 48130	No	No
Lafontaine Cadillac Buick GMC	4000 W Highland Rd, Highland, MI 48357	No	No
Lafontaine Chevrolet	40875 Plymouth Rd, Plymouth, MI 48170	No	No
Lafontaine Ford	5103 S Cedar St Lansing, MI 48911	No	No

Lafontaine Chevrolet Buick	3050 King Rd, China Township, MI 48054	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.

**7. MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.** To avoid disqualification, the bidder must provide documentation to support the following:

- a. **Copy of current State dealer license**
- b. **Copy of letter from floor plan source**
- c. **Copy of completed Schedule E – Affidavit for Driver Delivery**

Only proposals meeting the mandatory minimum requirements will be considered for evaluation.

**8. EVALUATION PROCESS.** The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
<b>1.</b>	COMPANY INFORMATION – Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4.	20
<b>2.</b>	CAPABILITIES - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements)	20
<b>3.</b>	PRIOR EXPERIENCE - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive)	20
<b>4.</b>	STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS – (must agree to terms)	20
<b>5.</b>	SCHEDULE A – STATEMENT OF WORK - (Must meet all requirements)	20
<b>Total</b>		<b>100</b>

Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points shall be awarded a contract.

**PRICING:** Price bidding on specified items shall occur in a closed solicitation at a later date. Only approved vendors from this pre-qualification solicitation shall participate.

The State strongly encourages strict adherence to the Contract Terms. The State reserves the right to deem a bid non-responsive for failure to accept the Contract Terms. Nevertheless, the bidder may submit proposed changes to the Contract Terms 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 Contract Terms. General statements, such as that the bidder reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions, may be considered non-responsive. Failure to respond timely to requests for proposed changes to Contract Terms during ongoing negotiations may be cause for disqualification.

The State may but is not required to conduct an on-site visit to tour and inspect the bidder's facilities; require an oral presentation of the bidder's proposal; conduct interviews, research, reference checks, and background checks; and request additional price concessions at any point during the evaluation process.

## II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Solicitation Manager in collaboration with Subject Matter Expert, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Yvon Dufour, Category Specialist, DTMB Central Procurement,	
Scott Poyer Fleet Specialist, MDOT – Transportation Systems Management and Operations	

## III. Evaluation Results

### Step 1 - Mandatory Minimums

Bidder	Meets	Deficiency
D & K Truck Sales	YES	NO
Gorno Ford	YES	NO
Tri-County International	YES	NO
Lunghamer Ford	YES	NO
Todd Wentzel Chevrolet	NO	Did not submit copy of state license and letter from floor plan source.
Lafontaine CDJR	YES	NO
Lafontaine Buick GMC (Lansing)	YES	NO
Lafontaine Chevrolet (Dexter)	YES	NO
Lafontaine Cadillac Buick GMC (Highland)	YES	NO
Lafontaine Chevrolet (Plymouth)	NO	Did not submit letter from floor plan source.
Lafontaine Ford	YES	NO
Lafontaine Chevrolet Buick GMC (China Twp.)	NO	Did not submit letter from floor plan source.

### Step 2 – Technical Evaluation

#### **A. D & K Truck Sales (D & K)**

The Evaluation Team determined that D & K, based on a score of 98/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

#### **1. COMPANY INFORMATION - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20**

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

2. **CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements). SCORE 20/20

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

3. **PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 20/20

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

4. **STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

5. **SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Schedule A.

**Total Score: 98/100**

## **B. Gorno Ford (Gorno)**

The Evaluation Team determined that Gorno, based on a score of 53/100, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 15/20

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

- a. Bidder's response to section 3 and a portion of section 4 was not submitted.

2. **CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements). SCORE 20/20

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

3. **PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 0/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit references.

4. **STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 0/20

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

5. **SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit pages 3, 6, and 15 of Schedule A.

**Total Score: 53/100**

## **C. Tri-County International (Tri-County)**

The Evaluation Team determined that Tri-County, based on a score of 100/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20

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

**2. CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements).

SCORE 20/20

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

**3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 20/20

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

**4. STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

**5. SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 20/20

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

**Total Score: 100/100**

**D. Lunghamer Ford (Lunghamer)**

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

**1. COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20

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

**2. CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements).

SCORE 20/20

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

**3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 20/20

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

**4. STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

**5. SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 20/20

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

**Total Score: 100/100**

**E. Lafontaine CDJR (CDJR)**

The Evaluation Team determined that CDJR, based on a score of 98/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20

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

- 2. CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements). SCORE 20/20

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

- 3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 20/20

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

- 4. STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

- 5. SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Schedule A.

**Total Score: 98/100**

#### **F. Lafontaine Buick GMC (LBGMC)**

The Evaluation Team determined that LBGMC, based on a score of 94/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20

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

- 2. CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder's response states line of credit from floor plan source is \$1,000,000., while letter from floor plan source indicates line of credit to be \$5,000,000.

- 3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for the following:

Experience 1: Missing "contact role at time of project", and "contact phone".

Experience 2: Missing "contact role at time of project", "contact phone", and "zip code".

Experience 3: Missing "contact role at time of project", "contact phone", and "zip code".

- 4. STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

- 5. SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Schedule A.

**Total Score: 94/100**

### **G. Lafontaine Chevrolet (LC Dexter)**

The Evaluation Team determined that LC Dexter, based on a score of 94/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20

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

2. **CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder's response states line of credit from floor plan source is \$1,000,000., while letter from floor plan source indicates line of credit to be \$5,000,000.

3. **PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for the following:

Experience 1: Missing "contact role at time of project", and "contact phone".

Experience 2: Missing "contact role at time of project", "contact phone", and "zip code".

Experience 3: Missing "contact role at time of project", "contact phone", and "zip code".

4. **STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

5. **SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Schedule A.

**Total Score: 94/100**

### **H. Lafontaine Chevrolet (LCBGMC)**

The Evaluation Team determined that LCBGMC, based on a score of 94/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20

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

2. **CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder's response states line of credit from floor plan source is \$1,000,000., while letter from floor plan source indicates line of credit to be \$5,000,000.

3. **PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for the following:

Experience 1: Missing "contact role at time of project", and "contact phone".

Experience 2: Missing "contact role at time of project", "contact phone", and "zip code".

Experience 3: Missing "contact role at time of project", "contact phone", and "zip code".

4. **STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

5. **SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 18/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit answers for sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Schedule A.

**Total Score: 94/100**

#### **I. Lafontaine Ford (L. Ford)**

The Evaluation Team determined that L. Ford, based on a score of 76/100, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **COMPANY INFORMATION** - Vendor Question Worksheet sections 1, 2, 3, & 4. SCORE 20/20

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

2. **CAPABILITIES** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 5 (must meet all requirements). SCORE 20/20

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

3. **PRIOR EXPERIENCE** - Vendor Question Worksheet section 6 (all 3 reference checks must be positive). SCORE 0/20

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

- a. Bidder did not submit references.

4. **STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS** - (must agree to terms). SCORE 20/20

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

5. **SCHEDULE A - STATEMENT OF WORK** - (Must meet all requirements). SCORE 16/20

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



a. Bidder did not submit answers for sections 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.2, and 3.5 of Schedule A.

**Total Score: 76/100**

#### IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Weight	D & K	Gorno	Tri-County	Lunghamer	CDJR	LBGMC	LC Dexter	LCBGMC	L. Ford
1. COMPANY INFORMATION	20	20	15	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
2. CAPABILITIES	20	20	20	20	20	20	18	18	18	20
3. PRIOR EXPERIENCE	20	20	0	20	20	20	18	18	18	0
4. STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS	20	20	0	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
5. SCHEDULE A – STATEMENT OF WORK	20	18	18	20	20	18	18	18	18	16
<b>Total:</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>76</b>

#### VI. Pricing Summary

This solicitation consists of the 1<sup>st</sup> stage to pre-qualify heavy truck dealers. No pricing was required in stage 1. A stage 2 closed bid among all awarded stage 1 dealers shall follow.

#### VII. 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.

**D & K, Tri-County, Lunghamer, CDJR, LBGMC, LC Dexter, and LCBGMC.** provide the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

1. Provides required license(s) to sell Cab & Chassis Heavy trucks.
2. Provides proof from their floor plan source that they are in good standing.
3. Provides required makes and models according to specifications required by the SOM.
4. Provides acceptance of all terms and conditions required by the SOM.
5. Provides references of similar size and scope that are in good standing.

The Buyer recommends that **D & K, Tri-County, Lunghamer, CDJR, LBGMC, LC Dexter, and LCBGMC.** be awarded a contract for pre-qualification of Cab & Chassis Heavy trucks.

Funding for this contract shall be as follows:

- \*\*\* **D & K** Award amount: \$15,000,000.00
- \*\*\* **Tri-County** Award amount: \$5,000,000.00
- \*\*\* **Lunghamer** Award amount: \$3,000,000.00
- \*\*\* **CDJR** Award amount: \$100,000.00 (all Lafontaine dealerships shall be under one contract)
- \*\*\* **LBGMC** Award amount: \$100,000.00 (all Lafontaine dealerships shall be under one contract)
- \*\*\* **LC Dexter** Award amount: \$100,000.00 (all Lafontaine dealerships shall be under one contract)
- \*\*\* **LCBGMC** Award amount: \$100,000.00 (all Lafontaine dealerships shall be under one contract)

\*\*\*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.