

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: NIA1 230000000170

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP Proposal #220000002930 for **Statewide Rubbish Removal and Recycling Services** and has recommended an award to **American Waste/GFL Environmental** in the amount of **\$2,450,808.00**, **Waste Management** in the amount of **\$9,595,491.42**, and **Republic Services** in the amount of **\$1,382,685.96** for a total award amount of **\$13,428,985.40**, pending State Administrative Board approval. 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:

Steve Rigg, Solicitation Manager

RiggS@michgan.gov

517-249-0454

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide **Statewide Rubbish Removal and Recycling Services**. The term of this contract is 3 years and 9 months, with up to 3 additional 1-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted in SIGMA VSS on Thursday, August 25, 2022. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of Wednesday, October 5, 2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
American Waste/GFL Environmental	4102 Industrial Dr. Harrison, MI 48625	NO
Granger Waste Services, Inc.	16980 Wood Rd. Lansing, MI 48906	NO
Republic Services	3432 Gembrit Circle Kalamazoo, MI 49001	NO
Waste Management of Michigan, Inc.	48797 Alpha Dr Wixom, MI 48393	NO

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

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.

Proposal Instructions:

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

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	30
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2–4	30
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-7 and 9–10	10
4.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 8 and 11	20
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	10
	Total	100

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

The State may utilize all bidder information, without regard to a proposal’s technical score, to determine fair market value for goods or services sought. The State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal. If applicable, the State’s evaluation will include consideration of a bidder’s qualified disabled veterans/service-disabled veteran owned business(QDV/SDVOB) status under MCL 18.1261(8). Additional information on the SDVOB preference is available at: Michigan.gov/SDVOB.

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 the Solicitation Manager in collaboration with the Joint Evaluation Committee which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	
Tim Cole, Buyer Department of Military & Veterans Affairs	Eames Groenleer Department of Corrections
Rob Telesz, Buyer DTMB Financial Services	Samantha Fusco, Buyer Department of Natural Resources
Lauri Bonnell, Buyer Department of Health and Human Services	Arnold VandeMark Department of Corrections
Patrick Avendt, Buyer Department of Natural Resources	Steve Rigg, Solicitation Manager DTMB Central Procurement Services
Advisory	
Alannah Doak, Buyer DTMB Central Procurement Services	Tony Edgecomb, DTMB Central Procurement Services

III. Evaluation Results

A. American Waste/GFL Environmental

The Evaluation Team determined that **American Waste/GFL Environmental**, based on a score of **90.8**, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

Note: On page 21 of the RFP at the beginning of Schedule A, there was an important note that stated “**There are specific requirements for which acceptance must be simply acknowledged through a checkbox(es), and others that require further explanation. Click one checkbox and complete the entries as identified.**” There were multiple sections that required the bidder to describe how they would comply with section requirements that were left blank.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1

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

- a. Section 1.1.F – Did not describe how they will accommodate Agency requests for regular pick-ups on specific scheduled days
- b. Section 1.2.2A – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
- c. Section 1.4.C, E, F, and H – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
- d. Section 1.6.A.7 - Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4

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

- a. Section 2.1 – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.

- b. Section 2.4.A, and B – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
 - c. Section 3.3 – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
 - d. Section 3.6.1 and 2 – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-7 and 9-10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 6.1 – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
 - b. Section 10.1 – Bidder did not confirm requirement with or without exception.
 - c. Section 10.5 – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 8 and 11
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 8 – Bidder did not confirm requirement with or without exception.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Incomplete information in sections 2, 5, 8, and 9

Total Score:90.8/100

B. Granger Waste Services, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that **Granger Waste Services, Inc.** based on a score of **84.8**, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

Note: On page 21 of the RFP at the beginning of Schedule A, there was an important note that stated “**There are specific requirements for which acceptance must be simply acknowledged through a checkbox(es), and others that require further explanation. Click one checkbox and complete the entries as identified.**” There were multiple sections that required the bidder to describe how they would comply with that sections requirements that were left blank.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sections 1.1.A, B, F, G, H, J, K, and L - Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
 - b. Sections 1.2.A, .2, .3, and .4 - Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
 - c. Sections 1.3.A, B, and C - Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
 - d. Sections 1.4.A, C, E, F, G, I, J, and K - Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.3, 3.6.1, and 3.6.2 - Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-7 and 9-10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 6.1 - Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 8 and 11
The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in these sections being scored.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Incomplete information in the Company Background of Section 2.

Total Score:84.8/100

C. Republic Services

The Evaluation Team determined that **Republic Services** based on a score of **99.6**, 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, Section 1
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Schedule A, 1.1.F – Bidder did not describe how they would comply with these requirements.
2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4

- a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in these sections being scored.
3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-7 and 9-10
 - a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in these sections being scored.
4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 8 and 11
 - a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in these sections being scored.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet
 - a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in these sections being scored.

Total Score:99.6/100

D. Waste Management of Michigan, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that **Waste Management of Michigan, Inc.** based on a score of **99.2**, 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, Section 1
 - a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in the sections being scored.
2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4
 - a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in the sections being scored.
3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-7 and 9-10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 7.1 – Takes acceptance.
4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 8 and 11
 - a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in the sections being scored.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet
 - a. The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory in the sections being scored.

Total Score:99.2/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	American Waste/GFL Environmental	Granger Waste Services, Inc.	Republic Services	Waste Management of Michigan, Inc.
1	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	27.2	20	29.6	29.6
2	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2–4	27.6	26.8	30	30
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-7 and 9–10	8.8	9.6	10	9.6
4	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 8 and 11	19.6	20	20	20
5	Vendor Questions Worksheet	7.6	8.4	10	10
	Total	90.8	84.8	99.6	99.2

V. Oral Presentations/Demonstrations

Both Republic Services and Waste Management were given the opportunity to give the JEC a demonstration on their reporting functions that will be available in the newly awarded contracts. The demonstration from both vendors has shown that having these functions available under new contracts will be of best value to the State to identify efficiencies in service as well as having sustainability reporting.

VI. Pricing Summary

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

NOTE: The price variance between each bidder is due to several factors. Bidders not bidding on every zip code, not providing rental fees, and/or not bidding on every container size compactor, or roll off dumpster. The majority of this award is based not only on price, but also includes number of zip codes that could be serviced in each region, container/compactor/roll off sizes offered, and the number of pickups per week that each bidder was willing to commit to.

	Deliverable	American Waste/GFL Environmental	Total Zip Codes Needing Services	Total Zip Codes Bid On	Comments
1	Zone 1	\$353,076.00	140	40	Award total \$341,556.00
2	Zone 2	\$188,760.00	78	62	Award total \$184,920.00
3	Zone 3	\$582,216.00	64	64	Award total \$290,460.00
4	Zone 4	\$361,260.00	185	80	No Award Amount
5	Zone 5	\$279,580.00	84	67	No Award Amount
6	Zone 6	\$1,740.00	128	25	No Award Amount
7	Zone 7	\$159,660.00	57	32	No Award Amount
8	Zone 8	\$0.00	102	0	No Award Amount
9	Zone 9	\$143,640.00	103	29	No Award Amount
10	Zone 10	\$376,200.00	221	221	No Award Amount
	Total		1162	620	53 percent statewide coverage

	Deliverable	Granger Waste Services, Inc.	Total Zip Codes Needing Services	Total Zip Codes Bid On	Comments
1	Zone 1	No Bid	140	0	No Bid
2	Zone 2	No Bid	78	0	No Bid
3	Zone 3	No Bid	64	0	No Bid
4	Zone 4	No Bid	185	0	No Bid
5	Zone 5	No Bid	84	0	No Bid
6	Zone 6	No Bid	128	0	No Bid
7	Zone 7	\$ 113,244.00	57	57	No Award Amount
8	Zone 8	No Bid	102	0	No Bid
9	Zone 9	No Bid	103	0	No Bid
10	Zone 10	No Bid	221	0	No Bid
		Total	1162	57	5 percent statewide coverage

	Deliverable	Republic Services	Total Zip Codes Needing Services	Total Zip Codes Bid On	Comment
1	Zone 1	No Bid	140	0	No Bid
2	Zone 2	\$168,809.56	78	28	Award total \$74,070.88
3	Zone 3	No Bid	64	0	No Bid
4	Zone 4	\$950,632.72	185	139	Award total \$187,989.24
5	Zone 5	\$105,967.24	84	23	No Award Amount
6	Zone 6	\$13,666.56	128	48	No Award Amount
7	Zone 7	\$198,835.20	57	42	\$198,835.20
8	Zone 8	\$363,110.12	102	78	No Award Amount
9	Zone 9	\$515,229.36	103	14	No Award Amount
10	Zone 10	\$368,477.64	221	169	No Award Amount
		Total	1162	541	47 percent coverage

NOTE: Republic did not provide rental fee in original bid.

	Deliverable	Waste Management of Michigan, Inc.	Total Zip Codes Needing Services	Total Zip Codes Bid On	Comment
1	Zone 1	\$335,987.41	140	85	Award total \$335,987.41
2	Zone 2	\$258,554.99	78	68	No Award Amount
3	Zone 3	\$674,949.00	64	64	Award total \$282,695.32
4	Zone 4	\$705,146.50	185	158	Award total \$705,146.50
5	Zone 5	\$310,485.84	84	84	Award total \$310,485.84
6	Zone 6	\$154,047.79	128	128	Award total \$154,047.79
7	Zone 7	\$263,120.21	57	57	No Award Amount
8	Zone 8	\$342,800.90	102	102	Award total \$342,800.90
9	Zone 9	\$738,822.20	103	68	Award total \$738,822.20
10	Zone 10	\$328,511.18	221	221	Award total \$328,511.18
		Total	1162	1035	89 percent coverage

Award Amounts Per Zone are for One Year. Total award to each vendor is for 3 years.

Deliverable	American Waste/GFL Environmental	Granger Waste Services, Inc.	Republic Services	Waste Management
Zone 1	\$341,556.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$335,987.41
Zone 2	\$184,920.00	\$0.00	\$74,070.88	\$0.00
Zone 3	\$290,460.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$282,695.32
Zone 4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$187,989.24	\$705,146.50
Zone 5	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$310,485.84
Zone 6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$154,047.79
Zone 7	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$198,835.20	\$0.00
Zone 8	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$342,800.90
Zone 9	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$738,822.20
Zone 10	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$328,511.18
Totals	\$816,936.00	\$0.00	\$460,895.32	\$3,198,497.14
Total 3-year amount	\$2,450,808.00	\$0.00	\$1,382,685.96	\$9,595,491.42

VII. Negotiations

Second round pricing was offered. Both GFL and Waste Management offered updated pricing that is reflected in the above pricing summary table.

VIII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidders who offer 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.

American Waste/GFL Environmental, Republic Services and Waste Management each provided best value to the State in certain areas. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

- Republic Services and Waste Management offer robust reporting functions through an online web portal that allows users to create agency specific accounts for their individual locations.
- Waste Management offers 89% coverage throughout the whole state followed by American Waste/GFL Environmental at 53%, and Republic Services at 47%.
- All 3 awarded vendors have a Michigan base with comparable financial impact.
- All 3 awarded vendors provided responses that sufficiently demonstrated experience and capabilities to meet expectations outlined in the bid.
- Having 3 awarded contracts will give the best coverage for a statewide solution.

Award Recommendation for the 3 years and 9-month base years is made to **American Waste/GFL Environmental** in the amount of **\$2,450,808.00**, **Waste Management** in the amount of **\$9,595,491.43**, and **Republic Services** in the amount of **\$1,382,685.96** for a total award amount of **\$13,428,985.39**.

Note: Please see attached spreadsheet – **RFP 22000002930 Rubbish and Recycling Final Awarded Locations** - for award by location and the annual estimated amount.