

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000278

The Department of Technology Management and Budget Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000000249 and has recommended awards to Alpine Janitorial Enterprises, Axiom Service, Inc., Customized Cleaning, Goodwill Industries of Southwestern Michigan, Inc., Grand Rapids Building Supply Company, and Hi-Tec Building Services, Inc., with a total value in the amount of \$4,974,700.39, 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 Janitorial Services. The term of new contract is 3 years with up to 2 renewal options. Awards made to Vendors with a current Janitorial contract issued in 2022 or later will have locations added to existing contract for the remaining period of said contract.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on November 18, 2022 and was posted for 28 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of December 15, 2022. Twelve Bidders submitted proposals, one Bidder was determined non-Responsive as required proposal documents were not submitted.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
Alpine Janitorial Enterprises, Inc.	8541 Rolling Acres NE Rockford, MI 49341	No
Axiom Service, Inc.	4695 Hilton Corporate Drive Columbus, OH 43232, INC	No
Caravan Facilities Mgmt.	4695 Hilton Corporate Drive Columbus, OH 43232, INC	No
Customized Cleaning	1310 ½ E. State St. Hastings, MI 49058	No

Goodwill Industries of Southwestern Michigan, Inc.	420 E. Alcott Kalamazoo, MI, 49001	No
Grand Rapids Building Supply Company	1200 Front Ave, NW Grand Rapids, MI 49504	No
Hi-Tec Building Services, Inc.	6578 Roger Drive, Suite A Jenison, MI 49426	No
KT Business Enterprises	4907 Chableau Drive Southwest Wyoming, MI 49519	No
Mighty Clear Cleaning Service, LLC	8830 220th Ave. Stanwood, MI 49346	No
Peckham, Inc.	3510 Capital City Blvd. Lansing, MI 48906	No
R & K Services, Service Master	4516 Pontiac Lake Rd Waterford, MI 48328-2055o	No
Harbor Shores Cleaning Co. Non-Responsive	300 W Mitchell St Petoskey, MI 49770	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 and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

Mandatory Site Visits for DTMB Locations Michigan Department of Management and Budget (DTMB) requires Site Visits for the DTMB locations and is to be scheduled with the location Program Manager or designee and completed prior to bid submission, see LSS document or Schedule B1, Location list for Program Manager contact information. Statements made by the Solicitation Manager or designee at the pre-proposal call are not considered revisions or additions to the solicitation.

Statements made by the Solicitation Manager or designee at a site visit/pre-proposal meeting are not considered modifications to the RFP. If, however, the Solicitation Manager determines modifications to the RFP are warranted after the meeting, modifications will be posted in writing on www.michigan.gov/SIGMAVSS as explained in the Modifications section of this document.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

Solicitation Instructions, Section 7, 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 3, 4, and 8	30
2.	Roles and Responsibilities Exhibit A – Section 3, Roles and Responsibilities	25
3.	Project Plan Management Exhibit A – Section 4, Project Work Plan	15
4.	Security - Exhibit A – Section 8	5
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	15
6.	Equipment – Schedule D	10
	Total	100

Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will have 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 a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Non-Voting
Lisa Spitzley, Category Analyst DTMB – Central Procurement Services	Larry Franklin, Training Coordinator DTMB – Financial Services
Vicki DeKruiger, Department Analyst DHHS – Facilities Purchasing Section	Bethany Jensen DTMB – Facilities Management
Timothy Cole, Buyer DMVA – Joint Forces Readiness Center	Clayton Nurenberg, Buyer EGLE – Purchasing
Ross Anderson, Buyer MDOS – Office of Financial Services	Jennifer Frank, Buyer LEO
Mark Morrison, Senior Level Buyer MDOT – Contract Services Division	Chris Hopcraft, Buyer MDOC – Procurement, Monitoring, & Compliance Division

III. Evaluation Results

A. Alpine Janitorial (100/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that Alpine 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. Service Capabilities, Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, excluding Sections 3, 4, and 8. (30/30)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (25/25)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (15/15)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (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:100/100

B. Axiom Services, Inc. (98/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that Alpine 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. Service Capabilities, Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, excluding Sections 3, 4, and 8. (28/30)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; the following deficiencies were noted.
 - a. Section 5.A.C. Bidder did not provide a quality assurance plan as requested.
2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted. (25/25)
3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (5/5)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (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:98/100

C. Caravan Facilities Management (CFM) (62/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that CFM based on a score of 62/100, did not 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 Sections 3, 4, and 8. (18/30)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, some responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section A, General Requirements, Bidder did not provide details describing how they would provide a clean, healthy, nor safe work environment at State Facilities.
 - b. Section 1.1. Specifications, All Floors, Bidder did not accept requirement, listed exceptions.
 - c. Section 1.2. Specifications, Carpeted Floors, Bidder did not accept requirement, listed exceptions.
 - d. Section 1.3. Specifications, Periodic Carpet Cleaning, Bidder did not accept requirement, listed exceptions.
 - e. Section 1.1.G. Materials, Treatment, Etc. Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested. The JEC notes Bidder did provide a Schedule D.
 - f. Section 1.1.K. Mechanical and Other Equipment Bidder did not accept requirement, listed exceptions for providing any outside equipment.

- g. Section 2.0., Damage to State-owned or Leased Property, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
 - h. Section 2.1., Health safety and Environmental Protection, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
 - i. Section 5.C. Inspection and Acceptance, Bidder did not provide details as to how they would comply with requirement as requested.
 - j. Section 7.A. Contract Management, Reporting, Bidder did not provide details regarding their reporting capabilities as requested.
 - k. Section 11, Additional Requirements, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
- 2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (14/25)**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, some responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 3.2. Key Personnel, Bidder did not provide contractor Key Personnel information as requested.
 - b. Section 3.3. Non-Key Personnel, Site Staffing, Bidder did not provide details regarding contingency plans for substitute staffing.
 - c. Section 3.5.B. Training and Certifications, Bidder did not provide detail as requested for JEC to determine training offered to or required of site staffing.
 - d. Section 3.6.2. Recruitment and Retention, Bidder did not provide as requested, an example of their recruitment advertisement nor provide any detail of the manner in which employees are recruited.
 - e. Section 3.6.3. Bidder did not provide details regarding employee benefits.
 - f. Section 3.6.4. Bidder did not provide details regarding starting wage or average wage or turnover rate, as requested.
- 3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (8/15)**
 The Evaluation Team determined that some of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:
- a. Section 4A, Project Work Plan, Bidder did not provide a project work plan as requested.
 - b. Section 4.B. Adjustments to Schedule, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
- 4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (0/5)**
 The Evaluation Team determined that some of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 8.A.1.-2., Contractor Responsibilities, Bidder did not describe how they would meet requirement such as to how they maintain a safe and secure work environment nor details regarding Drug Testing.
 - b. Section 8.A.3., DTMB Background Checks, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
 - c. Section 8.B, DTMB Office of Infrastructure, Security Program Coordinator (SPC) Responsibilities and other Agencies, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.

- d. Section 8.D. Keys, Codes, and Key Cards, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (12/15)
The Evaluation Team determined that most of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Experience 1, Bidder did not provide contact information of employer.
 - b. Experience 2, Bidder did not provide contact information of employer.
 - c. Experience 3, Bidder did not provide contact information of employer.
6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted

Total Score: 62/100

D. Customized Cleaning (100/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that Customized Cleaning 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. Service Capabilities, Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, excluding Sections 3, 4, and 8. (30/30)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (25/25)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (15/15)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (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:100/100

E. Goodwill Industries of Southwestern Michigan, Inc. (86/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that Goodwill Industries based on a score of 86/100, 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 Sections 3, 4, and 8. (26/30)

The Evaluation Team determined that most of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.1.E.2 Ashtrays Bidder did not accept requirement, listed exceptions for non-smoking location.
 - b. Section 1.1.E.3. Snow Removal, Bidder did not agree to requirement, Bidder listed exceptions to shoveling distance.
 - c. Section 9.2.A. Invoice Requirements, Bidder did not provide a copy of their Invoice Form.
2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (25/25)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
 3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (15/15)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
 4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (5/5)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
 5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (5/15)
 The Evaluation Team determined that some of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Experience 2, Bidder did not provide experience 2.
 - b. Experience 3, Bidder did not provide experience 3.
 6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.

Total Score: 86 /100

F. Grand Rapids Building Services (GRBS) (95/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that GRBS based on a score of 95/100, 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 Sections 3, 4, and 8. (30/30)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (22/25)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 3.2 Key Personnel, Bidder did not name Key Personnel but did indicate they will assign geographical area specific account managers.
 - b. Section 3.6.4. Based on Bidder's response, the JEC was unable to determine bidder's turnover rate, as requested, bidder listed their target turnover rate.
3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (13/15)

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

- a. Section 4A, Project Work Plan, Bidder did not provide all details requested for Project Work Plan, missing transition out and approach to keys/card/keys.
- 4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (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: 95/100

G. Hi-Tec Building Services, Inc (98/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that Hi-Tec 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. Service Capabilities, Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, excluding Sections 3, 4, and 8.
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
- 2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
- 3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (13/15)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 4A, Project Work Plan, Bidder did not provide all details requested for Project Work Plan, missing transition out.
- 4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (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: 98/100

H. KT Business Enterprises (97/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that KT Business Enterprises based on a score of 97/100, 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 Sections 3, 4, and 8. (30/30)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (25/25)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (15/15)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (5/5)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (12/15)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Experience 1, Bidder did not provide start date nor results obtained as requested. JEC did note bidder founded in 2022.
 - b. Experience 2, Bidder did not provide start date nor results obtained as requested.
 - c. Experience 3, Bidder did not provide start date nor results obtained as requested.
6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted

Total Score: 97 /100

I. Mighty Clear Cleaning Service, LLC (97/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that Mighty Clear based on a score of 97/100, 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 Sections 3, 4, and 8. (29/30)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 11, Additional Requirements, Bidder did not indicate as requested if PFAS is not contained in products used. JEC acknowledges Bidder indicated they will tailor chemical products to customer's preference/requirements.
2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (24/25)

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

3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (14/15)

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

- a. Section 4A, Project Work Plan, Bidder did not provide all details requested for Project Work Plan, missing transition out and approach to keys/card/keys.

4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (5/5)

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

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (14/15)

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

- a. Section 2 of Vender Questions Worksheet, Bidder did not indicate if receiving contract will increase gross revenue over 25%. Bidder did note gross sales in 2022.

6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)

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

Total Score: 97/100

J. Peckham, Inc 100/100

The Evaluation Team determined that Peckham 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. Service Capabilities, Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, excluding Sections 3, 4, and 8. (30/30)

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

2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (25/25)

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

3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (15/15)

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

4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (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: 100 /100

K. R & K Services, Service Master (56/100)

The Evaluation Team determined that R&K Services based on a score of 56/100, did not 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 Sections 3, 4, and 8. (21/30)

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

- a. Section A, General Requirements, Bidder did not provide details describing how they would provide a clean, healthy, nor safe work environment at State Facilities.
- b. Section 1.3. Specifications, Periodic Carpet Cleaning, Bidder did not accept requirement, listed exceptions.
- c. Section 1.1.G. Materials, Treatment, Etc. Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested. The JEC notes Bidder did provide a Schedule D.
- d. Section 2.0., Damage to State-owned or Leased Property, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
- e. Section 2.1., Health safety and Environmental Protection, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
- f. Section 5.C. Inspection and Acceptance, Bidder did not provide details as to how they would comply with requirement as requested.
- g. Section 7.A. Contract Management, Reporting, Bidder did not provide details regarding their reporting capabilities as requested.
- h. Section 11, Additional Requirements, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.

2. Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3 (7/25)

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

- a. Section 3.1. Contractor Representative, Bidder did not provide contractor representative information as requested.
- b. Section 3.2. Key Personnel, Bidder did not provide contractor Key Personnel information as requested.
- c. Section 3.3. Non-Key Personnel, Site Staffing, Bidder did not provide details regarding contingency plans for substitute staffing.
- d. Section 3.5.A., Uniform, Bidder did not provide details regarding company uniform.
- e. Section 3.5.B. Training and Certifications, Bidder did not provide detail as requested for JEC to determine training offered to or required of site staffing.

- f. Section 3.6.1. Recruitment and Retention, Bidder did not provide percentages of Site Staffing for direct and sub-contracted staff as requested.
 - g. Section 3.6.2. Recruitment and Retention, Bidder did not provide as requested, an example of their recruitment advertisement nor provide any detail of the manner in which employees are recruited.
 - h. Section 3.6.3. Bidder did not provide details regarding employee benefits.
 - i. Section 3.6.4. Bidder did not provide details regarding starting wage or average wage or turnover rate, as requested.
3. Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (8/15)
The Evaluation Team determined that some of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:
- a. Section 4A, Project Work Plan, Bidder did not provide a project work plan as requested.
 - b. Section 4.B. Adjustments to Schedule, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
4. Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8 (0/5)
The Evaluation Team determined that some of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 8.A.1.-2., Contractor Responsibilities, Bidder did not describe how they would meet requirement such as to how they maintain a safe and secure work environment nor details regarding Drug Testing.
 - b. Section 8.A.3., DTMB Background Checks, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
 - c. Section 8.B, DTMB Office of Infrastructure, Security Program Coordinator (SPC) Responsibilities and other Agencies, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
 - d. Section 8.D. Keys, Codes, and Key Cards, Bidder did not provide a response as to how they would comply with requirements as requested.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet (10/15)
The Evaluation Team determined that most of the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Experience 1, Bidder did not provide results of experience as requested.
 - b. Experience 2, Bidder did not provide results of experience as requested.
 - c. Experience 3, Bidder did not provide results of experience as requested.
 - d. Section 6, Standard Contract Terms, Bidder did not acknowledge if they agreed to Standard contract terms as requested, JEC notes no redlined terms were submitted,
6. Equipment, Schedule D (10/10)
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory; no deficiencies were noted

Total Score: 56/100

L. Harbor Shores Cleaning Company – Not Evaluated

Bidder has not met the requirements of being responsive and responsible as they did not provide completed Schedules as requested in proposal instructions. Therefore, bidder's proposal was unable to be evaluated.

IV. Technical Summary

Technical Evaluation Summary													
Technical Eval Criteria		Weight	Alpine	Axium	Caravan	Customized	Goodwill	GRBS	Hi-Tec	KT Ent.	Mighty	Peckham	R&K
1	Service Capabilities, Schedule A, Statement of Work, All Sections, excluding Sections 3, 4, and 8	30	30	28	18	30	26	30	30	30	29	30	21
2	Roles and Responsibilities, Schedule A. Statement of Work, Section 3	25	25	25	14	25	25	22	25	25	24	25	7
3	Project Plan, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4	15	15	15	8	15	15	13	13	15	14	15	8
4	Security, Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 8	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0
5	Vendor Questions Worksheet	15	15	15	12	15	5	15	15	12	14	15	10
6	Equipment, Schedule D	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Total		100	100	98	62	100	86	95	98	97	97	100	56

V. Pricing Summary

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

See attached Schedule B, Location and Pricing Summary Spreadsheet Comparison Excel Document.

VI. Negotiations

Negotiations were made regarding Additional Services Items and bids were updated, but this does not affect Award pricing amounts as Additional Services are utilized on an as needed basis and not included in annual costs.

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, total business costs and adequate service hours for location. Additionally, awarded Bidders have agreed to the Standard Contract Terms. It was determined that the MDOT Jackson locations be awarded to one bidder based on overall price and to aid in staffing.

The Award recommendation is made to Alpine Janitorial Enterprises, Axiom Service, Inc., Customized Cleaning, Goodwill Industries of Southwestern Michigan, Inc., Grand Rapids Building Supply Company, and Hi-Tec Building Services, Inc., with a total value in the amount of \$4,974,700.39, 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. For Specific Location Award Recommendations made, please see table below (Excel Spreadsheet also attached).

Line	Contract Number	TBD	Expiration Date After Options	Contractor	On CRO Set Aside	Location	Agency	City	County	Prosperity Regions Served	Pricing Year 1	Pricing Year 2	Pricing Year 3	Three Year Total	Number of Locations
A	22*0266		1/2/2026	ALPINE JANITORIAL	No	Location Name	Agency			All Regions				\$519,380.00	13
A1				ALPINE		DHHS Barry Co. (Loc #32)	DHHS	Hastings	Barry	4		\$25,010.00	\$25,010.00	\$50,020.00	
A2				ALPINE		DHHS Cass Co.	DHHS	Cassopolis	Cass	8		\$24,910.00	\$24,910.00	\$49,820.00	
A3				ALPINE		DHHS Mecosta/Osceola Co. (Loc. #2)	DHHS	Big Rapids	Mecosta	4		\$26,500.00	\$26,500.00	\$53,000.00	
A4				ALPINE		DHHS Montcalm Co. (Loc #11)	DHHS	Stanton	Montcalm	4		\$27,150.00	\$27,150.00	\$54,300.00	
A5				ALPINE		DHHS Oceana Co. (Loc #9)	DHHS	Hart	Oceana	4		\$26,550.00	\$26,550.00	\$53,100.00	
A6				ALPINE		DHHS St Joseph (Loc. #5)	DHHS	Centreville	St. Joseph	8		\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$52,000.00	
A7				ALPINE		Branch #206 Dowagiac	MDOC	Dowagiac	Cass	8		\$14,080.00	\$14,080.00	\$28,160.00	
A8				ALPINE		Branch #207 Niles	MDOS	Niles	Berrien	8		\$14,380.00	\$14,380.00	\$28,760.00	
A9				ALPINE		Branch #219 Albion	MDOS	Albion	Calhoun	8		\$13,430.00	\$13,430.00	\$26,860.00	
A10				ALPINE		Branch #368 Cheboygan	MDOS	Cheboygan	Cheboygan	3		\$14,580.00	\$14,580.00	\$29,160.00	
A11				ALPINE		Jackson Special Crews Facility	MDOT	Jackson	Jackson	9		\$11,650.00	\$11,650.00	\$23,300.00	
A12				ALPINE		University Region Materials & Testing Lab	MDOT	Jackson	Jackson	9		\$16,900.00	\$16,900.00	\$33,800.00	
A13				ALPINE		University Region Office	MDOT	Jackson	Jackson	9		\$18,550.00	\$18,550.00	\$37,100.00	
B	22*0267		1/2/2026	AXIUM SERVICES, INC	No	Location Name	Agency			Regions 2 Northwest, 4 West, 6 East, 7 South Central, 9 Southeast,				\$47,652.00	1
B1				AXIUM		Branch #371 Petoskey	MDOS	Petoskey	Emmet	2		\$15,884.00	\$15,884.00	\$47,652.00	
C	TBD		2/28/2026	Customized Cleaning	No	Location Name	Agency			4 West, 8 Southwest				\$2,825,288.76	11
C1				Customized Cleaning		DTMB Grand Rapids MSP Facility	DTMB	Grand Rapids	Kent	4	\$139,129.00	\$139,129.00	\$139,129.00	\$417,387.00	
C2				Customized Cleaning		DTMB Grand Rapids One Division Building	DTMB	Grand Rapids	Kent	4	\$118,408.00	\$118,408.00	\$118,408.00	\$355,224.00	
C3				Customized Cleaning		DTMB Grand Rapids State Office Building	DTMB	Grand Rapids	Kent	4	\$118,090.00	\$118,090.00	\$118,090.00	\$354,270.00	
C4				Customized Cleaning		Branch #216 Battle Creek	MDOS	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8	\$9,954.96	\$9,954.96	\$9,954.96	\$29,864.88	
C5				Customized Cleaning		Branch #247 Sparta	MDOS	Sparta	Kent	4	\$10,409.50	\$10,409.50	\$10,409.50	\$31,228.50	
C6				Customized Cleaning		Branch #255 Hudsonville	MDOS	Hudsonville	Ottawa	4	\$10,364.50	\$10,364.50	\$10,364.50	\$31,093.50	
C7				Customized Cleaning		Branch #256 Holland	MDOS	Holland	Ottawa	4	\$12,874.00	\$12,874.00	\$12,874.00	\$38,622.00	
C8				Customized Cleaning		Branch #257 Grand Haven	MDOS	Grand Haven	Ottawa	4	\$11,784.00	\$11,784.00	\$11,784.00	\$35,352.00	
C9				Customized Cleaning		Branch #259 Hastings	MDOS	Hastings	Barry	4	\$10,709.50	\$10,709.50	\$10,709.50	\$32,128.50	
C10				Customized Cleaning		Branch #263 Grand Rapids 28th St	MDOS	Grand Rapids	Kent	4	\$16,709.00	\$16,709.00	\$16,709.00	\$50,127.00	
C11				Customized Cleaning		Branch #273 Wyoming	MDOS	Wyoming	Kent	4	\$12,441.00	\$12,441.00	\$12,441.00	\$37,323.00	
D	TBD		2/28/2026	Goodwill	Yes	Location Name	Agency			4 West, 8 Southwest				\$798,526.01	1
D1				Goodwill	X	Kalamazoo Psychiatric Hospital	DHHS	Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo	8	\$261,947.67	\$266,171.07	\$270,407.27	\$798,526.01	
E	TBD		2/28/2026	GRBS	No	Location Name	Agency			4 West, 8 Southwest				\$746,553.00	8
E1				GRBS		DHHS Muskegon Co.	DHHS	Muskegon Heights	Muskegon	4	\$106,425.00	\$106,425.00	\$106,425.00	\$319,275.00	
E2				GRBS		Branch #201 Kalamazoo	MDOS	Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo	8	\$20,614.00	\$20,614.00	\$20,614.00	\$61,842.00	
E3				GRBS		Branch #203 Paw Paw	MDOS	Paw Paw	Van Buren	8	\$17,412.00	\$17,412.00	\$17,412.00	\$52,236.00	
E4				GRBS		Branch #223 Coldwater	MDOS	Coldwater	Branch	8	\$16,252.00	\$16,252.00	\$16,252.00	\$48,756.00	
E5				GRBS		Branch #224 Hillsdale	MDOS	Hillsdale	Hillsdale	9	\$12,856.00	\$12,856.00	\$12,856.00	\$38,568.00	

E6			GRBS		Muskegon TSC	MDOT	Muskegon	Muskegon	4	\$8,346.00	\$8,346.00	\$8,346.00	\$25,038.00	
E7			GRBS		Kalamazoo Transportation Service Center (KTSC)	MDOT	Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo	8	\$28,426.00	\$28,426.00	\$28,426.00	\$85,278.00	
E8			GRBS		Southwest Region Office (SWRO)	MDOT	Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo	8	\$38,520.00	\$38,520.00	\$38,520.00	\$115,560.00	
F	22*0270	1/2/2026	HI-TEC	No	Location Name	Agency			All Regions				\$351,274.00	43
F1			HI-TEC		DHHS Berrien Co. (Loc #7)	DHHS	Benton Harbor	Berrien	8		\$162,697.00	\$162,697.00	\$325,394.00	
F2			HI-TEC		DHHS Branch Co.	DHHS	Coldwater	Branch	8		\$38,985.00	\$38,985.00	\$38,985.00	
F3			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6900	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$16,980.00	\$16,980.00	\$33,960.00	
F4			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6901	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$4,620.00	\$4,620.00	\$9,240.00	
F5			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6903	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$3,360.00	\$3,360.00	\$6,720.00	
F6			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6905	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$15,180.00	\$15,180.00	\$30,360.00	
F7			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6909	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$6,300.00	\$6,300.00	\$12,600.00	
F8			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6911	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$11,100.00	\$11,100.00	\$22,200.00	
F9			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6913	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$12,180.00	\$12,180.00	\$24,360.00	
F10			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6914	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$13,800.00	\$13,800.00	\$27,600.00	
F11			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6915	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$4,380.00	\$4,380.00	\$8,760.00	
F12			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6916	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$4,500.00	\$4,500.00	\$9,000.00	
F13			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6917	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$3,420.00	\$3,420.00	\$6,840.00	
F14			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6922	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$7,800.00	\$7,800.00	\$15,600.00	
F15			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6923	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$12,900.00	\$12,900.00	\$25,800.00	
F16			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6925	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$3,720.00	\$3,720.00	\$7,440.00	
F17			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6930	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$15,600.00	\$15,600.00	\$31,200.00	
F18			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6950	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$2,520.00	\$2,520.00	\$5,040.00	
F19			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6954	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$4,020.00	\$4,020.00	\$8,040.00	
F20			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 6998	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$3,300.00	\$3,300.00	\$6,600.00	
F21			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 7020	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$12,180.00	\$12,180.00	\$24,360.00	
F22			HI-TEC		ANGB BLDG 7040	DMVA	Battle Creek	Calhoun	8		\$3,600.00	\$3,600.00	\$7,200.00	
F23			HI-TEC		FCEC 2900 1st Floor	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$21,950.00	\$21,950.00	\$43,900.00	
F24			HI-TEC		FCEC 2900 2nd Floor	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$18,980.00	\$18,980.00	\$37,960.00	
F25			HI-TEC		FCEC 2900 3rd Floor	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$12,940.00	\$12,940.00	\$25,880.00	
F26			HI-TEC		FCTC 2262 DL Fitness	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$9,540.00	\$9,540.00	\$19,080.00	
F27			HI-TEC		FCTC 2295 UTES	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$8,318.00	\$8,318.00	\$16,636.00	
F28			HI-TEC		FCTC 2501 HQ	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$7,795.00	\$7,795.00	\$15,590.00	
F29			HI-TEC		FCTC 2510 Environmental	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$6,316.00	\$6,316.00	\$12,632.00	
F30			HI-TEC		FCTC 2590 DPW	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$8,122.00	\$8,122.00	\$16,244.00	
F31			HI-TEC		FCTC 2594 DPW Maint. Shop	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$3,540.00	\$3,540.00	\$7,080.00	
F32			HI-TEC		FCTC 2661 Physical Fitness	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$13,160.00	\$13,160.00	\$26,320.00	
F33			HI-TEC		FCTC 2690 Logistics	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$10,089.00	\$10,089.00	\$20,178.00	
F34			HI-TEC		FCTC 2730 Distance Learning	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$7,840.00	\$7,840.00	\$15,680.00	
F35			HI-TEC		FCTC 3650 Range Control	DMVA	Agusta	Kalamazoo	8		\$9,234.00	\$9,234.00	\$18,468.00	
F36			HI-TEC		Kalamazoo Michigan Rehabilitation Services	LEO	Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo	8		\$19,727.00	\$19,727.00	\$39,454.00	
F37			HI-TEC		Kalamazoo District Office	EGLE	Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo	8		\$44,046.00	\$44,046.00	\$88,092.00	
F38			HI-TEC		KPEP BUILDING	MDOC	Benton Harbor	Berrien	8		\$13,800.00	\$13,800.00	\$27,600.00	
F39			HI-TEC		Coloma Maintenance Garage	MDOT	Benton Harbor	Berrien	8		\$19,712.00	\$19,712.00	\$39,424.00	
F40			HI-TEC		Coloma Business Office (CBO)	MDOT	Benton Harbor	Berrien	8		\$21,270.00	\$21,270.00	\$42,540.00	
F41			HI-TEC		Niles Maintenance Garage	MDOT	Niles	Berrien	8		\$21,054.00	\$21,054.00	\$42,108.00	
F42			HI-TEC		Paw Paw Central Repair	MDOT	Paw Paw	Van Buren	8		\$18,884.00	\$18,884.00	\$37,768.00	
F43			HI-TEC		Southwest Region M&T Lab	MDOT	Portage	Kalamazoo	8		\$20,218.00	\$20,218.00	\$40,436.00	
											Base 3-Yr Total		\$4,845,100.39	