

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: NIA1# 240000000312

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000002971 EGLE Groundwater Data Management System and has recommended an award to EarthSoft, Inc. in the amount of **\$1,544,755.00**, 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:

Jennifer Bronz, Solicitation Manager.
 bronzj@michigan.gov
 517-249-0493

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide EGLE Groundwater Data Management System. The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to 5-1-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on 8/14/2023 for 43 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 9/25/2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
EarthSoft Inc.	125 S. Alcaniz St., Suite 2, Pensacola, FL 32502	N	N
Ground Water Protection Council	13308 N. MacArthur Blvd., Oklahoma, OK 73142	N	N
Locus Technologies	299 Fairchild Drive, Mountain View, CA 94043	N	N
SAS Institute Inc.	100 SAS Campus Drive, Cary, NC 27513	N	N
Slalom Inc.	821 2 nd Avenue, Suite 1900, Seattle, WA 98104	N	N

*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.

Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

Minimum Requirements	
1.	Bidder must have an environmental Solution or similar and must be in production in another state, government entity or business a minimum of 1 year.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Criteria Name	Weight
1.	Schedule A – Statement of Work (Not including Business Specification Worksheet)	30
2.	Schedule A – Statement of Work – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet	50
3.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	10
4.	Attachment 1, Resume Template	10
	Total	100

Proposals receiving 80 or more evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and be considered for award.

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
Jennifer Bronz, Solicitation Manager – DTMB Central Procurement	Kevin McKnight, GIS Manager, EGLE
Brad Pagratis, Information Management Division Director, EGLE	Jim Wieber, Systems Architect, DTMB Agency Services

Voting	Advisory
Sara Pearson, Unit Supervisor, EGLE	James Milne, Water Use Assessment Unit Supervisor, EGLE
Ross Helmer, Geologist, EGLE	John Esch, Geologist, EGLE
Jeanette Clark, Manager, DTMB Agency Services	Jonathan Dashner, IT Specialist, DTMB Cyber Security
Dale Bridgford, Unit Supervisor, MMD Division, EGLE	Laura Brancheau, Business Relationship Manager, DTMB Agency Services
	Samar Benthami, PMO Manager, DTMB EPMO
	Sean Kolin, Project Manager, DTMB EPMO

III. Evaluation Results

A. Bidder 1 – EarthSoft, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that **EarthSoft Inc.** based on a score of **82.413**, did 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 (not including the Business Specification Worksheet) – 24.463/30

- a. Section 4 – IT Environment Responsibilities – Bidder Box 5, Bidder failed to provide the Disaster Recovery Plan with their submission of their proposal. Bidder indicated that they would send with signed NDA but failed to communicate that in advance of submitting their proposal. NDA could have been completed if the Bidder would requested the PSPs for review, but failed to do that. Bidder failed to respond to Bidder Box 10 as part of their proposal submission. **(-.265 deduction)**
- b. Section 6 – User Type and Capacity – Bidder Box 1, Bidder did not explain how they would be able to support the expected number of concurrent users. **(-.221 deduction)**
- c. Section 8 – Data Retention and Removal – Bidder Box 1, Bidder failed to respond to question in the bidder box. Information provided did not meet the requirement. **(-1.765 deduction)**
- d. Section 9 – End User and IT Operating Environment – Bidder Box 1, Bidder did not address the end user environment. Bidder Box 2, Bidder did not address the bidder box for this this section if they need access to State systems. Bidder Box 5, Bidder did not respond on how the State would have any decision-making in the process for upgrades, maintenance, and change control. **(-.529 deduction)**
- e. Section 10 – Software – Bidder Box 2, Bidder did not address any unique software requirements for the solution that they are providing. **(-.221 deduction)**

- f. Section 12 – Migration – Bidder Box 3, Bidder did not address how performance would impact the solution of it scaled up. Bidder did not address the requirement. **(-.441 deduction)**
 - g. Section 16 – Documentation – Bidder failed to provide examples of documentation per the requirement of the bidder box. **(-.882 deduction)**
 - h. Section 22 – Meetings – Bidder Box 1, Bidder only addressed the kick-off meeting, not facilitating weekly meetings after kick-off and during the term of the agreement. Bidder did not address how the meetings would be handled during the term of the agreement. **(-.882 deduction)**
 - i. Section 24 – Project Management – Bidder Box 1, Bidder did not address Suite and did not discuss in more detail their alternate plan. Bidder Box 4, Bidder did not address ongoing maintenance and support of the solution. Bidder also did not discuss other resources that would be part of the team to meet the requirements. **(-.331 deduction)**
- 2. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet – 47.950/50**
- a. Centralized Data Management System – Req. 30.0, Bidder did not explicitly commit to use the standard service protocol on the NGWMN. Req. 36.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. Req. 37.0-38.0, Bidder did not agree to use the standard service protocol on the NGWMN. Req. 43.0, Bidder did not commit to working with the State to develop EDD templates. **(-.992 deduction)**
 - b. Search Functions – Req. 73.0, Bidder marked as future enhancement, but did not say when the requirement would be available or indicate that they would meet the requirement. Req. 76.0, Bidder marked that the requirement was not available. **(-.529 deduction)**
 - c. Ad Hoc Query – Req. 142.0, Bidder indicated that the requirement was not available. **(-.265 deduction)**
 - d. Data Explorers – Req. 161.0, Bidder indicated that the requirement was not available. **(-.265 deduction)**
- 3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 7.50/10**
- a. Bidder did not demonstrate their experience to manage a contract of similar size and scope of the State of Michigan. **(-2.50 deduction)**
- 4. Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes – 2.50/10**
- a. Bidder Project Manager is only committed 20 hours per week, which is low for implementation of the solution and is already allocated to 65% for other projects, so availability could be of concern. Bidder Project Manager also did not demonstrate 5 years of experience. Bidder Technical Architect did not demonstrate 3 years of experience. Bidder Security Officer did not demonstrate experience with system security. **(-7.50 deduction)**

Total Score:82.413/100

B. Bidder # 2 – Ground Water Protection Council

Bidder #2 has not met the requirements of being responsive and responsible due to the Bidder is not Responsive. Bidder did not submit a proposal in accordance with the solicitation instructions. Bidder failed to respond to Mandatory Minimum Requirements, Vendor Questions Worksheet, Attachment 1 - Bidder Resumes, Schedule A, Schedule A - Table 1 - Business Specification Worksheet, Schedule B, C, D, E, F and G.

C. Bidder # 3 – Locus Technologies, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that **Locus Technologies, Inc.** based on a score of **86.719**, did 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 (not including the Business Specification Worksheet) – 24.629/30

- a. Section 5 – ADA Compliance – Bidder failed to address the PAT and not deadlines for implementation of ADA requirements in this section. **(-1.324 deduction)**
- b. Section 6 – User Type and Capacity – Bidder Box 1, Bidder failed to provide how the solution would scale up and down. **(-.441 deduction)**
- c. Section 8 – Data Retention and Removal – Bidder failed to address retention, instead of backup of State Data. **(-1.324 deduction)**
- d. Section 9 – End User and IT Operating Environment – Bidder Box 1, Bidder’s supported browsers are in conflict of the 2% traffic. Bidder does not support Safari. Bidder Box 2, Bidder response limits communication to all clients that may not be in the system daily. There should be a larger communication plan direct to the State. **(-.353 deduction)**
- e. Section 10 – Software – Bidder Box 7, Bidder did not address responsive design. **(-.055 deduction)**
- f. Section 11 – Integration – Bidder Box 1, Bidder failed to document that they meet the NGWMN API specifications. **(-.441 deduction)**
- g. Section 12 – Migration – Bidder Box 2, Bidder did not address database storage above and beyond the current size. **(-.110 deduction)**
- h. Section 23 – Project Control & Reports – Bidder Box, Bidder did not address reports for implementation or implementation in general. **(-1.324 deduction)**

2. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet – 47.090/50

- a. Centralized Data Management System – Req. 15.0, Bidder did not address the requirement on how to add more datasets. Req. 30.0, 37.0 – 38.0, Bidder did not address NGWMN requirements. **(-1.058 deduction)**

- b. Search Functions – Req. 76.0, Bidder marked as future enhancement, but did not state when the requirement would be available. **(-.265 deduction)**
- c. Dashboards – Req. 99.0 – 101.0, Bidder marked as future enhancement, but did not state when the requirement would be available. Req. 114.0 Bidder marked as future enhancement but did not state when the requirement would be available, and the bidder would not commit to the requirement. **(-1.058 deduction)**
- d. Reporting – Req. 120.0, Bidder marked as future enhancement, but did not state when the requirement would be available. **(-.265 deduction)**
- e. Data Explorers – Req. 165.0, Bidder marked as future enhancement, but did not state when the requirement would be available. **(-.265 deduction)**

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 10/10

- a. No deduction were taken for this section.

4. Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes – 5.0/10

- a. Bidder failed to provide commitment letters. Bidder Project Manager percent of time on the project is to low at 50%, especially for the implementation phase of the project. Bidder Project Manager has 6 active projects, the State has concerns about the dedication to the EGLE project. Bidder Project Manager educational background or training was not filled out. Bidder Technical Architect did not have a commitment to availability during the term of the agreement. **(-5.0 deduction)**

Total Score: 86.719/100

D. Bidder # 4 – SAS Institute, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that **SAS Institute, Inc.** based on a score of **68.911**, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

2. Schedule A – Statement of Work (not including the Business Specification Worksheet) – 22.456/30

- a. Section 4 – IT Environment Responsibilities – Bidder could only agree to 99.5% uptime, the State requires 99.98% uptime. Bidder redlined and added language to Schedule D – Service Level Agreement, that was not acceptable. Bidder struck most of the document, including but not limited to not taking responsibility for their 3rd party providers, removal of credits, and removal of RPO and RTO language. Bidder failed to agree to Schedule E Data Security Requirements, specifically the State’s PSP’s. Bidder also redlined Schedule E, adding language and struck language that is not acceptable. Bidder indicated that the State would have to follow the Bidder’s System Security Plan (SSP), not the State’s, this is not acceptable. Bidder failed to provide a Disaster Recovery Plan and that

they would not do one as required by the State. Bidder failed to identify Microsoft Azure as a Subcontractor. Bidder failed to respond to if they would require access to or copies of State Data or State hosted solutions. **(-.883 deduction)**

- b. Section 9 – End User and IT Operating Environment – Bidder did not fully address the requirement in bidder box 4 and did not document how communication would happen for changes to it’s software and architecture. **(-.265)**
 - c. Section 10 – Software – Bidder did not fully address the solution itself, instead of the platform in bidder box 1. Bidder did not address the requirements in bidder box 2 or 4. **(-.551 deduction)**
 - d. Section 11 – Integration – Bidder response to NGWMN did not meet the requirement and the bidder would not commit to the process provided by NGWMN. **(-.882 deduction)**
 - e. Section 12 – Migration – Bidder did not address support of current and future growth of the solution in bidder box 2. Bidder did not address how they would prevent performance issues dynamically in bidder box 3. Bidder did not address the requirement, discussed tools, but did not address the migration itself in bidder box 4. **(-1.213 deduction)**
 - f. Section 14 – Training Services – Bidder did not address what the point system means in their response and did not address the training for the solution itself the platform in bidder box 1. Bidder did not address training and documentation for the solution, only the platform in bidder box 2. **(-1.765 deduction)**
 - g. Section 15 – Transition Responsibilities – Bidder failed to provide the actual transition plan as part of their proposal. Developing it during implementation is not acceptable. **(-.882 deduction)**
 - h. Section 16 – Documentation – Bidder did not provide example of a user document and bidder did not address a user guide that would be specific to the State’s users. **(-.882 deduction)**
 - i. Section 24 – Project Management – Bidders language change from “Post Production Warranty” to “Post Production User Interface Support” is not acceptable. The bidder also mentions the use of Universal Terms which the State will not agree to. Bidder failed to meet the State’s warranty requirements. **(-.221 deduction)**
- 3. Schedule A – Statement of Work – Business Specification Worksheet – 38.955/50**
- a. Centralized Data Management – Req. 1.0 – 3.0, Bidder states that the requirement is a current capability, then go on to state in Column D that the functionality will have to be built during implementation. Req. 4.0 Bidder response was only limited to LIMS and did not address EDDs. Req.

5.0, 7.0 Bidder did not address EDDs. Req. 8 Bidder did not address who would be submitting datasets. Req. 11.0 Bidder did not describe how the requirement would work. Req. 18.0 – 21.0 Bidder did not address any of the data in the requirement. Req. 22.0 Bidder did not address export of the EDD file in CSV format. Req. 23.0 Bidder did not provide enough detail in their response. Req. 24.0 Bidder did not provide enough detail in relation to the State solution. Req. 25.0 Bidder failed to address how the data will be provided to external systems using APIs. Req. 26.0 Bidder only addressed receiving the data, not showing it. Req. 27.0 Bidder failed to address how exporting the data in CSV format to allow for import into GIS systems. Req. 28.0 Bidder failed to address EDD's from other systems. Req. 29.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. Req. 31.0 Bidder did not address how web services will share with external systems. Req. 33.0 Bidder indicated that it would require developers, that could add additional cost. Req. 35.0 Bidder failed to address how the System Administrator will maintain supporting data list through the user interface. Req. 43.0 Bidder marked as current capability, but really needs configuration. Req. 44.0 Bidder failed to provide photos and images with an EDD. Req. 52.0 Bidder did not provide enough detail on the tracking of failures of file uploads. Req. 54.0 Bidder did not address all values, not just min. and max. **(-2.910 deduction)**

- b. Application Interface Data Entry – Req. 61.0 Bidder marked as current capability, but really needs configuration. Req. 69.0 Bidder examples were only numeric and there could have been other factors. **(-.265 deduction)**
- c. Search Functions – Req. 72.0 Bidder did not describe how the user could conduct searches. Req. 73.0 Bidder did not address and/or understand the requirement. Req. 74.0 Bidder did not discuss how each support condition would function in the solution. Req. 75.0 Bidder did not address how the user would open the search criteria. Req. 76.0, 78.0 – 84.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. **(-1.124 deduction)**
- d. User Management – Req. 87.0 – 92.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. **(-.397 deduction)**
- e. Dashboard – Req. 94.0 – 97.0, 100.0 – 101.0, 103.0 – 114.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. Req. 99.0 -100.0 Bidder implies that the State would be developing the code to generate the Piper and Stiff diagram. It's the expectation of the State the Bidder would be developing the code for the State. **(-1.257 deduction)**
- f. Reporting – Req. 115.0 Bidder did not address having an instruction menu for running reports. Req. 120.0 Bidder implies that the State would be developing the code to generate the Groundwater Flow Direction Map. It's the expectation of the State the Bidder would be developing the code for the State. Req. 116.0 – 119.0, 121.0 – 130.0, 132.0 – 134.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. **(-1.389 deduction)**

- g. Ad Hoc Query – Req. 137.0 – 147.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. **(-.728 deduction)**
- h. Data Explorers – Req. 148.0 Bidder did not indicate how and when our ESRI licenses would be used. Req. 157.0 – 161.0, 165.0 – 169.0, 171.0 – 172.0, 185.0 Bidder did not address the requirement. **(-1.653 deduction)**
- i. Training – Req. 186.0 – 190.0 Bidder did not address training for the solution itself, not the platform. **(-1.323 deduction)**

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 2.5/10

- b. Bidder’s experience was not environmental experience. Bidder stated that they submitted redlines to the terms, but nothing was attached with their submission. The bidder also sent an order form and Master Agreement that they expected to State to agree to. The State will not agree to any other terms but ours. Bidder failed to agree to Schedule C – Insurance Requirements and redlined the schedule.

5. Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes – 5/10

- b. Contractor Project Manager was only committed 50% of the time, that is not enough for implementation. Bidder also did not provide a Contractor Project Manager with a minimum of 5 years of experience. Bidders Contractor Security Officer did not have any type of allocation for a Key Personnel Resource.

Total Score: 68.991/100

E. Bidder # 5 – Slalom, Inc.

Bidder #5 has not met the requirements of being responsive and responsible due to the Bidder failing to disclose their direct experience in environmental solutions a minimum of 1 year. Bidder mentions Salesforce, but the requirement was directed at the bidder’s direct experience, not Salesforce.

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria		EarthSoft, Inc.	Locus Technologies, Inc.	SAS Institute, Inc.
1	Schedule A – Statement of Work (not including the Business Specification Worksheet)	24.463	24.629	22.456
2	Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet	47.950	47.090	38.955

3	Vendor Questions Worksheet	7.500	10.000	2.500
4	Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes	2.500	5.000	5.000
	Total	82.413	86.719	68.911

V. Oral Presentations/Demonstrations

Oral presentations and demonstrations were completed as part of the evaluation process.

VI. Pricing Summary

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

	Deliverable	EarthSoft, Inc.	Locus Technologies, Inc.
1	Subscription Licensing	\$894,855.00	\$7,119,175.00
2	Implementation Costs	\$514,900.00	\$1,594,000.00
3	Future Enhancements	\$135,000.00	\$0.00
	Total Price	\$1,544,755.00	\$8,713,175.00

VII. Negotiations

Negotiations were completed with EarthSoft, Inc.

VIII. 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 determined by the Bidder who meets the requirements, offers the lowest overall price, most modern and ease of use solution as demonstrated by its proposal and demonstration of the solution. Bidder also provided additional reporting formats above and beyond what the State requested.

Award Recommendation is made to EarthSoft, Inc. in the amount of **\$1,544,755.00**.