

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 24000000364

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Request For Proposal (RFP) 230000003158 Statewide Ergonomic and General Office Seating and has recommended an award to Haworth, Inc., in the amount of \$15,120,000.00, 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:

Susan Watt-Smith, Solicitation Manager
WattSmithS@michigan.gov
 517-230-0535

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide ergonomic and general office seating. The term of this contract is five (5) years, with up to two (2) renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Friday, September 22, 2023, for five (5) weeks. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of October 30, 2023, at 3:00 p.m. Eastern:

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Haworth, Inc.	One Haworth Center, Holland, MI 49423	No	Yes
MarxModa, Inc.	751 Griswold Street, Detroit, MI 48226	No	
Steelcase, Inc.	901 44 th Street, Grand Rapids, MI 49508	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.

Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

- Bidder must be the manufacturer, or the authorized dealer or distributor of the manufacturer, of the new products proposed.
- All three (3) Bidders, Haworth, Inc., MarxModa, Inc., and Steelcase, Inc., met the Mandatory Minimum Requirements and will be considered for evaluation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

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

Step 1: Technical Evaluation. Will be completed and scored according to the scoring format listed below.

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work (Excluding Section 3. Staffing, Section 4. Project Management, Section 9. Invoice and Payment, and Section 11. Service Level Agreements)	45
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 3 Staffing	20
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4. Project Management, Section 9. Invoice and Payment, and Section 11. Service Level Agreements	20
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet: Section 2.13., and Section 5. Prior Experience	15
	Total	100

Step 2: Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation score will have its samples evaluated. Sample chairs will be evaluated on the following factors.

	Sample Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Product Quality, Fit and Finish (does it match the quality of the current line, does it match the line being proposed in the written proposal)	10
2.	Ease of use of product (does product come with instructions, are the mechanics of the chair easily understood)	5
3.	Delivery (was it delivered properly, was the chair damaged in any way, did the chair include a detailed delivery slip)	5
	Total	20

Step 3: Proposals passing Steps 1 and 2 will have their pricing evaluated and considered for award.

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

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by the Solicitation Manager in collaboration with a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Keith Belonga, Section Manager Department of Transportation	Lauri Bonnell Department of Health and Human Services
Jamie Cutler, Department Specialist Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs	Simrandeep Singh Department of Technology, Management and Budget
Becky Durrant, Property Analyst Department of Health and Human Services	Barbara Thelen, Departmental Manager Department of Technology, Management and Budget
Nicole Mitchell, Project Manager Department of Technology, Management and Budget	Gene Wood Department of Corrections
Susan Moyer, Department Specialist Department of Health and Human Services	
Curt Myers, Section Manager Department of Technology, Management and Budget	
Jamie Phillippo, Move Manager Department of Technology, Management and Budget	
Erika Shrauger, Departmental Analyst/Interior Designer Department of Technology, Management and Budget	
Susan Watt-Smith, Category Analyst Department of Technology, Management and Budget	
Nicole Willson, Executive Assistant Department of Corrections	

III. Evaluation Results

A. Haworth, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Haworth, Inc., based on a score of **93.50**, 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, Sections 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10.** The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. **Section 1.2.5.:** Bidder did not agree to the following requirement:
“Contractor must have the ability to make the product line and the colors in each product line that the State selects available and/or compatible for minimum of 1 (one) year after expiration of the Contract.”
 - b. **Section 1.2.5. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe how they would comply with making the product lines and the colors in each product line that the State selects available and/or compatible for minimum of 1 (one) year after expiration of the Contract.
 - c. **Section 2.1.3.:** Bidder did not agree to the following requirements: “The Contractor must provide a Quick Ship Delivery Program. The Contractor must include the allowable quantity under the quick ship delivery program. Contractor must also include the selection of standard products available under the quick ship delivery program. Contractor must also be willing to modify their quick ship delivery program throughout the Contract period in order to accommodate State of Michigan standard product and color requirements.

The receipt of order date is pursuant to Section 2, Notices, of the Standard Contract Terms.”
 - d. **Section 2.1.5.1.:** Bidder did not agree to this requirement. Bidder stated in their original response that “All situations will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis with emphasis being on maintaining Haworth’s Change Order Policy. Please see Schedule A- Attachments “2. Service Requirements/2.1 Delivery/ 2.1.6 Cancellations/ Returns” for reference.”
 - e. **Section 2.1.5.2.:** Bidder did not sufficiently answer if they agree to allowing the State to cancel the order (s) in whole or in part, refuse shipment, purchase the goods elsewhere, and/or hold the Contractor accountable for all damages and direct costs resulting from the Contractor’s failure to deliver on schedule.
 - f. **Section 2.1.6.:** Bidder did not agree to having a process in place to cancel orders and/or accept returns.
 - g. **Section 7.4.:** Bidder did not agree to the following requirement:
“Packaging must be optimized to permit the lowest freight rate. Shipments must be palletized whenever possible using manufacturer's standard 4-way shipping pallets.”
 - h. **Section 7.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not describe how they will optimize packaging to permit the lowest freight rate.

- i. **Section 10.1. Bidder Box 6:** Bidder did not sufficiently discuss how old seating will be disposed of if it cannot be recycled.
- j. **Section 10.2. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently identify any hazardous chemicals are used in their products.
- k. **Section 10.2. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe how their products are labeled.

Score: 42.50/45

2. **Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 3.** The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. **Section 3.9.:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain, of the total bid, the price of the subcontractor's work for all 5 subcontractors listed.

Score: 19/20

3. **Schedule A – Statement of Work, Sections 4, 9, and 11.** The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. **Section 4.3. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not clearly label items 1 – 8 in the Implementation plan. Additionally, in question (1) Bidder did not sufficiently describe their implementation plan; question (2) Bidder did not sufficiently describe how to manage a transition; question (4) Bidder did not sufficiently describe all tasks, duties, or responsibilities associated with implementation and complete Contract administration; and in question (8) Bidder did not sufficiently describe any additional information or considerations for Services to begin by the Contract Effective date and continue thereafter for the Contract term.
 - b. **Section 4.4.2.:** Bidder did not provide a high level summary table showing annual State spend in their sample Purchasing Activity report.
 - c. **Section 4.4.3.:** Bidder's sample Lead Time report does not provide the days to process the order.
 - d. **Section 9.1.:** Bidder did not agree to the State's invoice details.
 - e. **Section 11.2. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain how they will provide prior notice of product shortages to the State in SLA Metric 3.

Score: 17/20

4. **Vendor Questions Worksheet, Sections 2.13, and 5.** No deficiencies in this Section.

Score: 15/15

Total Score: 93.50/100

B. MarxModa, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Haworth, Inc., based on a score of **81.00**, 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, Sections 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10.** The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. **Section 1.1. Bidder Box 2.:** The bidder did not provide testing results for the following chairs: MultiGenerational, Life, and Pixel; testing results for the 9 to 5 chairs were mislabeled as Verus chair.
 - b. **Section 1.1.2.:** The 4D arms on the Bidders proposed highly ergonomic task chairs do not rotate.
 - c. **Section 1.2.1. Bidder Box 1.:** Bidder did not provide length of time replacement chair parts will be made available.
 - d. **Section 1.2.1. Bidder Box.:** Bidder did not provide obsolescence policy for 9 to 5 or Muuto chairs.
 - e. **Section 1.2.2.1. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder’s statement “does not align with the check box of no exception to the requirement.
 - f. **Section 1.2.2.2. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not explain the process for reporting warranty issues for 9 to 5 Seating.
 - g. **Section 1.2.2.3. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not provide a timeframe for repairs/replacements due to damaged or defective product, and they Bidder did not describe how products will be repaired.
 - h. **Section 1.2.2.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not provide a timeframe for warranty work to be completed.
 - i. **Section 1.3. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe process for recall and replacement for 9 to 5 and Muudo seating.
 - j. **Section 1.3.1. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe the process for coordinating with Contract Administrator and Program Manager for recall and replacement for 9 to 5 and Muudo seating products.
 - k. **Section 1.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe MillerKnoll Quality Assurance Program when discussing product and did not address the Quality Assurance Program for 9 to 5 and Muudo seating products.
 - l. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder response provided from the perspective of the manufacturer not the dealer (actual bidder). Bidder did not include transportation method for 9 to 5 and Muuto seating products.
 - m. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder response provided from the perspective of the manufacturer not the dealer (actual bidder). Bidder did

not include procedure for product delivery and installation for 9 to 5 and Muuto seating products.

- n. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 3:** Bidder did not answer the question in that they provided the same answer from Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 2.
- o. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 6:** Bidder did not sufficiently discuss their staging capabilities at Stare or off-site location(s).
- p. **Section 2.1.3. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe their quick ship program: the JEC felt noted the either the Bidder does not have a quick ship program or the items have to be pre-ordered by the State and stored at a warehouse for future quick delivery orders.
- q. **Section 2.1.3. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder provided the same answer as for Section 2.1.3. Bidder Box 1 thus they did not sufficiently describe their delivery program for Quick Ship orders.
- r. **Section 2.1.7:** Bidder did not provide a procedure for 9 to 5, Muuto, and Knoll seating products.
- s. **Section 2.2.D:** Bidder omitted the following items from their Project Summary Packet:
 - i. The short-back stool was missed on the pricing/specification sheet.
 - ii. In the open office area, there was an overage of task seating (51 vs. 43).
 - iii. Bidder provided brochures instead of cut-sheets, and the information provided was not specific to the products in the packet.
 - iv. Page breaks in the pricing summary made it hard to follow.
 - v. Flooring finishes in the renderings appeared different than the flooring the State specified for this project.
 - vi. Bidder didn't utilize the variety of options within seating product lines, the JEC noted there was a lack of creativity in this.
- t. **Section 2.2.J. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not sufficiently discuss how to handle ordering errors and returns.
- u. **Section 2.3.2. Bidder Box:** The Bidder did not discuss manufacturer's installation guidelines from all manufacturers and was did not sufficiently discuss their installation process.
- v. **Section 2.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder stated they would respond within 1 business day which is not necessarily the same as 24 hours if the call is on a Friday. The Bidder did not sufficiently discuss on-site service timeframes.

- w. **Section 7.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder does not describe how 9 to 5 and Muuno seating products are packaged/palletized.
- x. **Section 10.1. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not discuss any relevant 3rd party certification (or lack of them) or any bio-based products.
- y. **Section 10.2. Bidder Box 1:** MarxModa is the Bidder but all the answers in this section are from the perspective of MillerKnoll and there is no mention of 9 to 5 seating.
- z. **Section 10.3 Bidder Box:** Bidder did not explain how 9 to 5 or Muuto seating products address this Section.
- aa. **Section 10.4. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not explain how 9 to 5 or Muuto seating products address this Section.
- bb. **Section 10.5. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not explain how 9 to 5 or Muuto seating products address this Section.

Score: 31.25/45

2. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 3. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. **Section 3.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not clearly explain who the single point of contact for the Contract would be as they listed the Program Manager and Customer Service Representative for both MarxModa and MillerKnoll. Therefore, it was unclear to the State which company would be the contract holder.
- b. **Section 3.4.5. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not provide proof of authorization to install 9 to 5 or Muuto seating lines.
- c. **Section 3.5. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not provide a resume for Jen Simmons.
- d. **Section 3.6.2. Bidder Box 3:** Bidder did not indicate they are authorized to sell, service, and install 9 to 5 or Muuto Seating, and the letter incorrectly references Schedule J – Authorization instead of Schedule L – Certification.
- e. **Section 3.7. Bidder Box:** Bidder’s Organizational Chart is incomplete in that there is no connection shown between MarxModa and MillerKnoll, 9 to 5, and Muuto. In addition, names for the roles listed as reporting to Brian Johnson, Sean Rolland, Michael Levitt, Lauren Williams, and MaKensie Weldon were not provided.
- f. **Section 3.9.:** Bidder did not provide any information in the Disclosure of Subcontractors table for GDBE.
- g. **Section 3.11. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not indicate how long drug tests are held onto.

Score: 16.75/20

3. **Schedule A – Statement of Work, Sections 4, 9, and 11.** The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. **Section 11, Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not state how long it would take to follow up and resolve the issue once the State has been directed to the appropriate MarxModa Department.
 - b. **Section 11, Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not provide sufficient explanation of how long it would take to follow up with the State as part of their process.

Score: 19.50/20

4. **Vendor Questions Worksheet, Sections 2.13, and 5.** The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. **Sections 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3:** All of the projects are for total office furniture packages where seating is just a part. Therefore, it was unclear to the State how much of each project was allocated to seating.

Score: 13.50/20

Total Score: 81/100

C. Steelcase, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Haworth, Inc., based on a score of **86.25**, 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, Sections 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10.** The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- cc. **Section 1.2.1. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain the length of time replacement warranty parts will be provided at no charge to the State.
 - dd. **Section 1.2.1. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain their obsolescence policy.
 - ee. **Section 1.2.2.7. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain how they would handle repairs due to damaged or defective product.
 - ff. **Section 1.2.5. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain how they will make the product line and the colors in each product line that the State selects available and/or compatible for a minimum of 1 year after expiration of the Contract.
 - gg. **Section 1.3. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not clarify how they would notify the State within 5 calendar days of a product recall and referenced Project Manager instead of Program Manager.

- hh. **Section 1.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not adequately explain their Quality Assurance Program related to manufacturing, shipping, and delivery.
- ii. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain their transportation method for standard delivery/drop ship. Also, Bidder did not provide a list of dealers within the Steelcase Dealer Network.
- jj. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe their Drop Shipment procedure as part of Standard delivery.
- kk. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 3:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe their Standard Delivery procedure for product only.
- ll. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 4:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain the anticipated lead time (ARO) from manufacturer. Additionally, Bidder did not provide lead time for product(s).
- mm. **Section 2.1.2. Bidder Box 6:** Bidder did not sufficiently discuss staging capabilities at the State or off-site locations.
- nn. **Section 2.1.3. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe their procedure for product delivery and installation for Quick Ship products.
- oo. **Section 2.2.D.:** Bidder omitted the following items from their Project Summary Packet:
 - vii. Seating names are not identified on 3D drawings for clarification; drawings were not sufficiently labeled (had to hunt to find things on the drawing)
 - viii. No key on provided on the install drawing indicating what chair is in what area per fabric/finish- no differentiation between the drawing
 - ix. Installation notes were not complete.
 - x. Bidder provided brochures instead of cut-sheets, and the information provided was not specific to the products in the packet
 - xi. Bidder didn't utilize the variety of options within seating product lines, the JEC noted there was a lack of creativity in this.
- pp. **Section 2.2.J. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not sufficiently discuss how to handle overages and ordering errors and how to handle returns for the items in question.
- qq. **Section 2.2.K. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently explain their resolution process for correcting inaccuracies.
- rr. **Section 2.3.2. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe the manufacturers' recommended install process.

- ss. Section 2.4. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe technical support in their response.
- tt. Section 10.1. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently discuss if any materials used in their products are environmentally friendly.
- uu. Section 10.1. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not provide enough detail on how their products are labeled.
- vv. Section 10.1. Bidder Box 6:** Bidder did not discuss their process for disposing of old seating if it cannot be recycled. Additionally, Bidder did not explain who the third-party end-of-use service providers are.

Score: 36.25/45

2. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 3. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 3.7. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not identify all Non-Key Personnel by name and title on the organizational chart. It is unclear if the State has a direct connection to NBS.
- b. Section 3.9.:** Bidder did not provide any information in the Disclosure of Subcontractors table for GDBE.
- c. Section 3.10. Bidder Box 1:** Bidder is Steelcase, but the response is provided from the perspective of NBS.
- d. Section 3.10. Bidder Box 2:** Bidder is Steelcase, but the response is provided from the perspective of NBS.
- e. Section 3.10. Bidder Box 3:** Bidder is Steelcase, but the response is provided from the perspective of NBS.

Score: 17.75/20

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Sections 4, 9, and 11. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 4.3. Bidder Box:** Bidder did not adequately discuss their 1). implementation plan and/or milestones, 2). Bidder did not detail how they would work with the previous contract holder to transition to the new contract.
- b. Section 4.4.2. Bidder Box:** Bidder's Sample Purchasing Activity Report was missing the following details: total value of purchases per each agency, detailed ship to location (address), product specific detail, service specific detail for installation, high-level summary page does not identify agencies, does not indicate the frequency of reporting (annual basis).
- c. Section 4.4.3. Bidder Box:** Bidder's Sample Lead Time Report does not indicate if orders are shipping complete.

- d. **Section 11.3. Customer or Warranty Service, Bidder Box 1:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe how the CSR will respond to the State’s questions and concerns.
- e. **Section 11.3. Customer or Warranty Service, Bidder Box 2:** Bidder did not sufficiently describe how the Contractor will follow up with the State Project Manager until the Service is completed for replacement parts that may need to be ordered.

Score: 17.75/20

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet, Sections 2.13, and 5. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. **Section 5.3:** This experience is for a total office furniture package where seating is just a part. Therefore, it was unclear to the State how much of the project was allocated to seating.

Score: 14.50/15

Total Score: 86.25/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work and Vendor Questions Worksheet

Selection Criteria		Haworth, Inc.	MarxModa, Inc.	Steelcase, Inc.
1	Schedule A, Statement of Work (Excluding Section 3. Staffing, Section 4. Project Management, Section 9. Invoice and Payment, and Section 11. Service Level Agreements) (45 points)	42.50	31.25	36.25
2	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 3 Staffing (20 points)	19.00	16.75	17.75
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4. Project Management, Section 9. Invoice and Payment, and Section 11. Service Level Agreements (20 points)	17.00	19.50	17.75
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet: Section 2.13., and Section 5. Prior Experience (15 points)	15.00	13.50	14.50
Total (100 points)		93.50	81.00	86.25

2. Seating Samples

Selection Criteria		Haworth, Inc.	MarxModa, Inc.	Steelcase, Inc.
1	Product Quality, Fit and Finish (10 points)	9.90	8.25	9.70
2	Ease of Use of Product (5 points)	5.00	4.25	4.85
3	Delivery of Sample (5 points)	5.00	4.50	5.00
Total (20 points)		19.90	17.00	19.55

V. Pricing Summary

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

Deliverable	Haworth, Inc.	MarxModa, Inc.	Steelcase, Inc.
1 Total Seating*	\$13,461,158.26	\$13,999,686.51	\$13,911,308.87
2 Total Delivery**	\$875,472.00	\$647,088.00	\$570,960.00
3 Total Travel***	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Price	\$14,338,230.26	\$14,646,774.51	\$14,482,268.87

*Calculated with Historical Usage quantities

**For simplification of Total Delivery Cost, Zone 1 pricing used.

***For simplification of Total Travel Cost, Zone 1 Flat Rate pricing is used.

VI. Negotiations

Bidders were asked to submit second round pricing. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

Deliverable	Haworth, Inc.	MarxModa, Inc.	Steelcase, Inc.
1 Total Seating*	\$13,461,158.26	\$13,987,695.26	\$13,479,142.40
2 Total Delivery**	\$875,472.00	\$647,088.00	\$570,960.00
3 Total Travel***	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Price	\$14,338,230.26	\$14,634,783.26	\$14,050,102.40

* Calculated with Historical Usage quantities

**For simplification of Total Delivery Cost, Zone 1 pricing used.

*** For simplification of Total Travel Cost, Zone 1 Flat Rate pricing is used.

****See Also Schedule B T-1 Pricing Summary-Final.pdf

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.

Haworth, Inc. provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

- a. Haworth met the minimum point threshold and offered the best combination of factors as a Type 1 (Full Scope) proposal;
- b. Haworth offered multiple alternates in all product categories, which offers the State multiple seating options and price points;
- c. Haworth's agreement with the State's Standard Contract Terms without exceptions;
- d. After a careful review of the product reviewed and proposed, the Haworth materials appeared to be of higher quality, with superior fit, finish, and ease of use, which meet and exceed the ergonomic requirements for State of Michigan employees.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award.

The JEC determined that a resulting contract to Haworth, Inc. would present the best value to the State of Michigan. Award Recommendation is made to Haworth, Inc. in the amount of \$15,120,000.00.