

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000103

The Department Technology, Management, and Budget office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000003125 and has recommended an award to Hi-Tec Building Services, Inc. in the amount of \$7,100,000.00 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:

Lisa Spitzley, Solicitation Manager.
 spitzleyL4@michigan.gov
 (517) 249-0440

Background Information: This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Housekeeping and Laundry Sorting Services for Michigan Veteran Homes at Chesterfield Township and Michigan Veteran Homes at Grand Rapids. The term of this contract is Three years, with up to Two, 1-year renewal options.

Bidders: The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Monday, September 11, 2023, for Thirty-three days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of Friday, October 13, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Forefront Healthcare, LLC	22622 Harper Avenue St. Clair Shores, MI 48080	N	Y
Hi-Tec Building Services, Inc.	6578 Roger Drive, Suite A Jenison, MI 49426	N	Y
Peckham, Inc. *CRO	3510 Capital City Blvd. Lansing, MI 48906	N	Y
The FOG Group, Inc., dba Powerlink	24562 Romano Warren, MI 48091	Y	Y

Facilities Management Services			
Yona Solutions, LLC	1541 S. Waukegan Rd. Waukegan, IL 60085	N	Y

*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 Requirements

Bidders were required to attend a Mandatory Site Visit at the Michigan Veterans Home at Grand Rapids on Friday, September 22, 2023. It is verified that all Bidders attended the Mandatory Site Visit.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Evaluation Criteria for all locations contained in this RFP	Weight
1.	Service Capabilities – Schedule A – Statement of Work, All Sections, excluding Sections Roles and Responsibilities, Project Work Plan, Security	30
2.	Roles and Responsibilities Exhibit A – Section: Roles and Responsibilities	25
3.	Project Plan Management Exhibit A – Section: Project Work Plan	15
4.	Security – Section: Security	5
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	15
6.	Equipment – Schedule D	10
	Total	100

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

II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting	
Kerri Bielsky, Buyer	DTMB
Lisa Spitzley, Category Specialist	DTMB
Non-Voting -Subject Matter Experts (SME)	
Jennifer Manning, SME/Program/Business Manager - Chesterfield	DMVA
Carly MacDonald, SME/Business Manager, Grand Rapids	DMVA
Clarence Sinkler, Jr., SME/Facility Manager MVH Grand Rapids	DMVA

III. Evaluation Results

A. Forefront Healthcare

The Evaluation Team determined that Forefront Healthcare based on a score of 93, did meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Service Capabilities - Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, Excluding Staffing, Project Plan, and Security (30/30)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
2. Roles and Responsibilities (Staffing) - Schedule A, Statement of Work (20/25)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 6.2. Key Personnel, Bidder did not provide contractor Key Personnel information nor Key Personnel resumés as requested.
3. Project Work Plan - Schedule A, Statement of Work (15/15)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work (3/5)

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

- a. Section 6.7.A. Security, Bidder did not provide Scope of Background Checks nor if employees wear uniforms or badges as requested.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (15/15)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

Total Score: 93 /100

B. Hi-Tec Building Services

The Evaluation Team determined that Hi-Tec based on a score of 99, did meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Service Capabilities - Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, Excluding Staffing, Project Plan, and Security The (30/30)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

2. Roles and Responsibilities (Staffing) - Schedule A, Statement of Work (24/25)

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

- a. Section 6.4. Organizational Chart, Bidder did not provide a Chart or Table as requested, JEC notes that Bidder did provide a list of staff members.

3. Project Work Plan - Schedule A, Statement of Work (15/15)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work (5/5)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (15/15)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

Total Score: 99/100

C. Peckham, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Peckham based on a score of 89, did meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Service Capabilities - Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, Excluding Staffing, Project Plan, and Security (29/30)

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

- a. Section 13.1, Environmental and energy Efficient Products, Bidder indicated use of Environmentally Friendly Products but did not provide list as requested.

2. Roles and Responsibilities (Staffing) - Schedule A, Statement of Work (25/25)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

3. Project Work Plan - Schedule A, Statement of Work (11/15)

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

- a. Section 11.A., Project Work Plan, Bidder did not provide details regarding Contingency Plan nor Quality Assurance plan within Project Work Plan.

4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work (5/5)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (9/15)

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

- a. Experience 1, Experience is similar size, but scope of experience does not include residential care setting, nor does it include laundry sorting service experience.
- b. Experience 2, Experience is similar size, but scope of experience does not include residential care setting, nor does it include laundry sorting service experience.
- c. Experience 3, Experience is similar size, but scope of experience does not include residential care setting, nor does it include laundry sorting service experience.

6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

Total Score: 89/100

D. The Fog Group, Inc., dba PowerLink

The Evaluation Team determined that PowerLink based on a score of 95, did meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Service Capabilities - Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, Excluding Staffing, Project Plan, and Security (29/30)

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

- a. Section 13.1, Environmental and energy Efficient Products, Bidder indicated use of Environmentally Friendly Products but did not provide list as requested.

2. Roles and Responsibilities (Staffing) - Schedule A, Statement of Work (25/25)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

3. Project Work Plan - Schedule A, Statement of Work (15/15)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work (5/5)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (11/15)

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

- a. Experience 3, Experience is similar size, but scope of experience does not include residential care setting, nor does it include laundry sorting service experience.
- b. Section 2, Vendor Questions Worksheet, Bidder did not indicate Gross Revenue would be increased by 25% if awarded, nor did they provide plan on how the company will scale-up to manage this increase. Bid is more than 25% of 2022 gross annual sales.

6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

Total Score: 95 /100

E. Yona Solutions, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Yona Solutions based on a score of 89, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Service Capabilities - Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, Excluding Staffing, Project Plan, and Security (28/30)

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

- a. Section 2.1., Statement of Work, Bidder did not describe how they would provide services as requested. JEC notes that bidder did provide Schedule D and LSS documents as requested.

2. Roles and Responsibilities (Staffing) - Schedule A, Statement of Work (19/25)

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

- a. Section 6.2. Key Personnel, Bidder did not provide contractor Key Personnel information nor resumés as requested.
- b. Section 6.4. Organizational Chart, Bidder did not provide a Chart or Table as requested, JEC notes that Bidder did provide a list of staff members.

3. Project Work Plan - Schedule A, Statement of Work (13/15)

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

- a. Section 11.A., Project Work Plan, Bidder did not provide details regarding Contingency Plan, JEC notes that a Quality Assurance plan was listed under reporting section.

4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work (4/5)

Summarize the overall results for this section, i.e., The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:]

- a. Section 6.7.A. Security, Bidder did not provide Scope of Background Checks, JEC notes that Bidder did list fingerprinting and registry checks.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (15/15)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

Total Score: 89/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	Weight	Forefront	Hi-Tec	Peckham	PowerLink	Yona
1	Service Capabilities	30	30	30	29	29	28
2	Roles and Responsibilities	25	20	24	25	25	19
3	Project Work Plan	15	15	15	11	15	13
4	Security	5	3	5	5	5	4
5	Vendor Question Worksheet	15	15	15	9	11	15
6	Equipment Schedule D	10	10	10	10	10	10
	Total	100	93	99	89	95	89

V. Pricing Summary

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

	Location/Building	Forefront	Hi-tec	Peckham	PowerLink	Yona
					SDVOB	
1	Chesterfield	\$3,255,084.36	\$3,001,200.00	No Bid for this location.	\$3,714,889.02	\$3,231.831.90
2	Grand Rapids 2950	\$3,255,084.36	\$2,934,000.00	\$4,705,967.94	\$3,695,389.02	\$3,276,831.90

	Location/Building	Forefront	Hi-tec	Peckham	PowerLink SDVOB	Yona
3	Grand Rapids 3000	\$23,507.31	\$39,060.00	\$66,332.79	\$445,408.77	\$62,109.30
	Total Price	\$6,533,676.03	\$5,974,260.00	\$4,772,300.73	\$7,855,686.81	\$6,570,773.10
		(All 3 locations)	(All 3 locations)	(2 Grand Rapids locations only)	(All 3 locations)	(All 3 locations)

VI. Negotiations

Negotiations were made in the form of 2nd Round pricing and regarding Additional Services Items. The following is a summary of 2nd Round price proposals. Additional Services pricing does not affect Award pricing amounts as Additional Services are utilized on an as needed basis and not included in annual or base rate costs.

(see Attached Pricing Comparison document)

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.

The Michigan Veteran Home, Grand Rapids was approved as a Community Rehabilitation Organization (CRO) Set-Aside location with the stipulations that the CRO Vendor pass technical, and the bid be within fair market value. The proposal submitted by the lone CRO vendor passed technical, but the bid was deemed to be outside fair market value as it is 57.7% higher than the awarded bidder and 48.5% higher than the median bid price.

It is also noted a proposal was submitted by a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Business and a 10% consideration was calculated, but even with consideration, proposal was not best value.

Hi-Tec provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include experience with housekeeping in health care setting and laundry services, price, and sufficient oversight staff.

It is noted that economic impact is not a factor in the decision-making process for this Award as all bidders are equal in this aspect as they are each considered a Michigan Geographically Disadvantage Business Enterprise (GDBE).

Award Recommendation is made to Hi-Tec Building Services, Inc., a Michigan Geographically Disadvantage Business Enterprise (GDBE), in the amount of **\$7,100,000.00** (Bid amount **\$5,870,220.00** plus approximately an additional 20% for potential Additional Services).