THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

RFQ014917 - Mobile Health Clinic - Mobile Health Clinic

Project Overview

Project Details	
Reference ID	RFQ014917 - Mobile Health Clinic
Project Name	Mobile Health Clinic
Project Owner	Lorraine Bells
Project Type	CSP
Department	Purchasing
Budget	$0.00 - $0.00
Project Description	1.0 SCOPE AND CLASSIFICATION 1.1 Scope: The City of Columbus, Department of Public Health is seeking Best Value Procurement (BVP) to enter into a contract to purchase one (1) Mobile Health Clinic model unit. 1.2 Classification: The contract resulting from the BVP will provide for the purchase and delivery of one (1) mobile health clinic as specified and agreed upon. Bidders are required to show experience in providing this type of equipment and warranty service as detailed in these specifications. 1.3 Specification Questions: Questions regarding this RFP (Best Value) must be submitted on the portal by 11:00 am on Thursday, March 5, 2020. Responses and any necessary addenda will be posted as an amendment to this RFP on the portal no later than Monday, March 9, 2020 at 4:00p.m. 1.4 For additional information concerning this bid, including procedures on how to submit a proposal, you must go to the City of Columbus Vendor Services web site at http://vendors.columbus.gov/sites/public and view this bid number. 1.5 Best Value Procurement Model: The City of Columbus is using a Best Value Procurement in lieu of the Invitation to Bid model. The award will not be made to the lowest, responsive, and responsible bidder. The contract will be awarded based upon: (1) Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response, (2) Sufficiency of design, layout and equipment, (3) Ability and Customer

	Service, (4) Relevant Experience, (5) Schedule and Delivery, and other evaluation criteria referred to in Columbus City Code 329.18 or as defined herein.
Open Date	Feb 20, 2020 2:00 PM EST
Close Date	Apr 02, 2020 11:00 AM EDT

Highest Scoring Supplier	Score
La Boit Specialty Vehicles, Inc.	**113.67 pts**

Conflict of Interest

##RFP/RFSQ EVALUATION COMMITTEE ##CONFLICT OF INTEREST/CONFIDENTIALITY CERTIFICATION Please read this document in its entirety, complete as directed, initial at the bottom of each page, sign where indicated, and provide the document to the Chair of the RFP/RFSQ Evaluation Committee. In accordance with Columbus City Code sections 329.27/329.28, and to protect the integrity and competitiveness of the RFP/RFSQ process, proposals must be evaluated in an unbiased and equitable manner, and without any conflict of interest. The contents of, or deliberations pertaining to, any proposal or statement of qualifications submitted to the City of Columbus (“City”) shall remain confidential from the time the RFP/RFSQ is advertised until the evaluation process has concluded and the selection has been made public. As an evaluator/subject matter expert, you will be charged with ensuring fair, competitive access to City contracts by responsible contractors and ethical conduct that fosters public confidence in the City’s procurement process. You acknowledge that you shall not use any information obtained as an RFP/RFSQ evaluator for personal, pecuniary, or other benefit. Upon a public request, a proposal may only be reviewed by those outside the RFP/RFSQ process once the selection has been made public unless certain portions of the proposal are deemed confidential or otherwise cannot be made available for release. ###Conflict of Interest or Bias A conflict of interest, or appearance of a conflict of interest, may arise if you are directly or indirectly affiliated with any individual or business entity that has submitted a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors for this project. You must immediately notify the Committee Chair of any potential conflict of interest or the appearance thereof that arise at any point during the RFP/RFSQ process. Further, you must recuse yourself once the proposals are submitted and an actual conflict of interest is determined to exist. I certify that I, and to the best of my knowledge, members of my family,[i] or business associates that may affect my objectivity or judgment, or present an appearance of impropriety: 1. Are not current employees of, nor advisors, consultants, or other related positions with any individual or business entity that has submitted a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors for this project. 2. Are not directors, officers, owners, partners, agents, or representatives of any individual or business entity that has submitted a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors for this project. 3. Do not

hold any ownership, stock[ii] debt, or any other financial interest in any individual or business entity that has submitted a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors for this project. I certify that I will not during the RFP/RFSQ process: 1. Solicit or accept, directly or indirectly, any employment or business opportunity, or any promise of future employment or business opportunity from, or engage, directly or indirectly, in any discussion of employment or future employment or business opportunity with, any director, officer, owner, partner, employee, representative, agent or consultant of an offeror that submits a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors for this project. 2. Request, demand, exact, solicit, seek, accept, receive, or agree to receive, directly or indirectly, any money, gratuity, or any other item of value from any director, officer, owner, partner, employee, representative, agent, or consultant of an offeror that submits a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors for this project. Based on my obligations under this certification, I will immediately report the circumstances to the Committee Chair if at any time during the RFP/RFSQ process: 1. I receive a contact from an offeror that submits a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors, concerning employment or any other business opportunity related to this particular RFP/RFSQ. 2. I receive an offer of a gift or any other item of value from an offeror that submits a proposal or statement of qualifications, or their proposed subcontractors. 3. I encounter circumstances from which my participation might result in a real, apparent, or potential conflict. ###Confidentiality I certify that I will not divulge nor make known, in any manner whatsoever, to any person, other than a member of the RFP/RFSQ evaluation committee who has signed a confidentiality statement for the same procurement, or to an investigatory or law enforcement authority, after consultation with the City Attorney's Office, any information (which has not already been made available to the public or all interested offerors) pertaining to any and all aspects of the RFP/RFSQ including but not limited to the contents of offerors' proposals or statements of qualifications, the status of the process, scoring method, points allotted, evaluator scores, costs, or any other confidential information regarding the RFP/RFSQ process. City of Columbus employees who do not serve on the RFP/RFSQ evaluation committee may be consulted for purposes of providing relevant information specific to this RFP/RFSQ (i.e., technical, cost/budget, past performance information) to the evaluation committee and/or Department Director or designee. 1. I understand that unauthorized sharing of information outside the scope of this RFP/RFSQ process may give an offeror an unfair advantage over another offeror and thereby render the process invalid. 2. I understand that if I divulge such information I may be subject to disciplinary action, including termination of my employment with the City. ###Signature and Certification I have read and understand the certifications set out in this document. I further acknowledge that by signing this document, I confirm my understanding of the certifications herein. [i] Per City of Columbus Executive Order 2016-01, family member is defined as follows: spouse, parents, siblings, children, grandparents, grandchildren, stepparents, step-children, or stands in loco parentis; any other person related by blood or marriage to the public official or employee, including uncles, aunts, nephews, nieces, cousins, and in-laws, and residing in the same household. [ii] A stockholder does not occupy a position of profit in the prosecution of a public contract awarded to the corporation provided that: (a) The official owns less than one percent of the corporation's stock; (b) The official has no financial or fiduciary relationship to the corporation other than stockholding; and (c) The corporation is not a closely held corporation with a limited number of stockholders [OEC Adv. Op. No. 2009-05]. http://www.ethics.ohio.gov/education/factsheets/full_outline_of_the_ohio_ethics_law.pdf

Name	Date Signed	Has a Conflict of Interest?
Lorraine Bells	Apr 21, 2020 2:57 PM EDT	No
john King	Apr 06, 2020 11:47 AM EDT	No
Anita Clark	Apr 04, 2020 1:56 PM EDT	No
Johanna Taylor	Apr 04, 2020 2:19 PM EDT	No

Signatures

Name	Signatures
Lorraine Bells (Project Owner)	
Johanna Taylor (Evaluator)	
Anita Clark (Evaluator)	
john King (Evaluator)	
Roblyn Slaughter (Advisor)	
Mary Lyles (Advisor)	

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Questions and Answers

No messages

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Public Notices

No messages

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Internal Discussions

No messages

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Submissions

Supplier	Date Submitted	Name	Email	Confirmation Code
La Boit Specialty Vehicles, Inc.	Mar 29, 2020 11:23 AM EDT	Jeff Blais	jblais@laboit.com	NzU3Mzk=
Quality Vans & Specialty Vehicles	Mar 31, 2020 5:09 PM EDT	Thomas Ragland	thomas@qualityvans.com	NzYwNDk=
Farber Specialty Vehicles	Apr 02, 2020 9:59 AM EDT	REED HARSTER	rharster@farberspecialty.com	NzYyNTU=
CT DEFENSE	Mar 31, 2020 3:52 PM EDT	Michael Pine	mpine@cinetransformer.com	NzYwMjM=
esec corp dba Columbus Peterbilt	Apr 01, 2020 3:00 PM EDT	tim darr	timdarr@ameritech.net	NzYxNjY=
LDV Inc.	Apr 01, 2020 2:24 PM EDT	Allee Wulfekuhle	awulfekuhle@ldvusa.com	NzYxNjA=

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Project Criteria

Criteria	Points	Description
Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	15 pts	
Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	50 pts	
Ability and Customer Service	5 pts	
Relevant Experience	10 pts	
Schedule and Delivery	20 pts	
A - Cost	**30 pts**	
A-1 - cost	30 pts	
Total	**130 pts**	

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Scoring Summary

Active Submissions

	Total	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience
Supplier	**/ 130 pts**	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**
La Boit Specialty Vehicles, Inc.	113.67 pts	14 pts	47.67 pts	4.333 pts	9.333 pts

	Schedule and Delivery	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Supplier	**/ 20 pts**	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
La Boit Specialty Vehicles, Inc.	14.33 pts	24 pts	24 pts

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Eliminated Submissions

	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience	Schedule and Delivery
Supplier	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**	**/ 20 pts**
Quality Vans & Specialty Vehicles	12.33 pts	41.67 pts	3.333 pts	8.333 pts	6.667 pts
Farber Specialty Vehicles	12.33 pts	41.67 pts	4 pts	9 pts	9 pts
LDV Inc.	10.67 pts	39.67 pts	3.333 pts	8.333 pts	7 pts
esec corp dba Columbus Peterbilt	7.333 pts	28 pts	3.333 pts	7.333 pts	12.67 pts
CT DEFENSE	0.66667 pts	3.333 pts	0.66667 pts	2.667 pts	0.33333 pts

	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Supplier	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Quality Vans & Specialty Vehicles	25 pts	25 pts
Farber Specialty Vehicles	-	-
LDV Inc.	-	-
esec corp dba Columbus Peterbilt	-	-
CT DEFENSE	-	-

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Reason

Supplier	Disqualified by	Reason
Quality Vans & Specialty Vehicles	Lorraine Bells	Award made to LaBoit Specialty Vehicles
Farber Specialty Vehicles	Lorraine Bells	Award made to LaBoit Specialty Vehicles
CT DEFENSE	Lorraine Bells	Award made to LaBoit Specialty Vehicles
esec corp dba Columbus Peterbilt	Lorraine Bells	Award made to LaBoit Specialty Vehicles
LDV Inc.	Lorraine Bells	Award made to LaBoit Specialty Vehicles

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Proposal Scores

La Boit Specialty Vehicles, Inc. - Scoring Summary

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Total	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience
Reviewer	**/ 130 pts**	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**
Johanna Taylor	106 pts	12 pts	48 pts	4 pts	8 pts
Anita Clark	92 pts	15 pts	45 pts	4 pts	10 pts
john King	119 pts	15 pts	50 pts	5 pts	10 pts
	Average:	**14 pts**	**47.67 pts**	**4.333 pts**	**9.333 pts**
		↓	↓	↓	↓

	Total	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience
Reviewer	**/ 130 pts**	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**
Calculated:	**113.67 pts**	**14 pts**	**47.67 pts**	**4.333 pts**	**9.333 pts**

	Schedule and Delivery	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Reviewer	**/ 20 pts**	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Johanna Taylor	6 pts	28 pts	28 pts
Anita Clark	18 pts	-	-
john King	19 pts	20 pts	20 pts
	14.33 pts	**Average:**	**24 pts**
	↓		↓

	Schedule and Delivery	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Reviewer	**/ 20 pts**	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Calculated:	**14.33 pts**	**24 pts**	**24 pts**

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Quality Vans & Specialty Vehicles - Scoring Summary (Eliminated)

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience	Schedule and Delivery
Reviewer	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**	**/ 20 pts**
Johanna Taylor	12 pts	45 pts	3 pts	9 pts	5 pts
Anita Clark	12 pts	40 pts	4 pts	8 pts	5 pts
john King	13 pts	40 pts	3 pts	8 pts	10 pts
Average:	**12.33 pts**	**41.67 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**8.333 pts**	**6.667 pts**
	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Calculated:	**12.33 pts**	**41.67 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**8.333 pts**	**6.667 pts**

	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Reviewer	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Johanna Taylor	-	-
Anita Clark	25 pts	25 pts
john King	-	-
Average:	**Average:**	**25 pts**
		↓
Calculated:	**25 pts**	**25 pts**

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Farber Specialty Vehicles - Scoring Summary (Eliminated)

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience	Schedule and Delivery
Reviewer	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**	**/ 20 pts**
Johanna Taylor	12 pts	45 pts	3 pts	9 pts	7 pts
Anita Clark	13 pts	45 pts	4 pts	9 pts	10 pts
john King	12 pts	35 pts	5 pts	9 pts	10 pts
Average:	**12.33 pts**	**41.67 pts**	**4 pts**	**9 pts**	**9 pts**
	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Calculated:	**12.33 pts**	**41.67 pts**	**4 pts**	**9 pts**	**9 pts**

	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Reviewer	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Johanna Taylor	-	-
Anita Clark	-	-
john King	-	-
Average:	**Average:**	**-**
		↓
Calculated:	**-**	**-**

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

CT DEFENSE - Scoring Summary (Eliminated)

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience	Schedule and Delivery
Reviewer	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**	**/ 20 pts**
Johanna Taylor	0 pts	0 pts	0 pts	2 pts	0 pts
Anita Clark	2 pts	10 pts	1 pts	5 pts	1 pts
john King	0 pts	0 pts	1 pts	1 pts	0 pts
Average:	**0.66667 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**0.66667 pts**	**2.667 pts**	**0.33333 pts**
	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Calculated:	**0.66667 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**0.66667 pts**	**2.667 pts**	**0.33333 pts**

	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Reviewer	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Johanna Taylor	-	-
Anita Clark	-	-
john King	-	-
Average:	**Average:**	**-**
		↓
Calculated:	**-**	**-**

esec corp dba Columbus Peterbilt - Scoring Summary (Eliminated)

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience	Schedule and Delivery
Reviewer	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**	**/ 20 pts**
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	45 pts	5 pts	9 pts	19 pts
Anita Clark	5 pts	10 pts	1 pts	6 pts	2 pts
john King	8 pts	29 pts	4 pts	7 pts	17 pts
Average:	**7.333 pts**	**28 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**7.333 pts**	**12.67 pts**
	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Calculated:	**7.333 pts**	**28 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**7.333 pts**	**12.67 pts**

	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Reviewer	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Johanna Taylor	-	-
Anita Clark	-	-
john King	-	-
Average:	**Average:**	**-**
		↓
Calculated:	**-**	**-**

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

LDV Inc. - Scoring Summary (Eliminated)

Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response	Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment	Ability and Customer Service	Relevant Experience	Schedule and Delivery
Reviewer	**/ 15 pts**	**/ 50 pts**	**/ 5 pts**	**/ 10 pts**	**/ 20 pts**
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	45 pts	4 pts	9 pts	2 pts
Anita Clark	10 pts	40 pts	3 pts	8 pts	10 pts
john King	13 pts	34 pts	3 pts	8 pts	9 pts
Average:	**10.67 pts**	**39.67 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**8.333 pts**	**7 pts**
	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Calculated:	**10.67 pts**	**39.67 pts**	**3.333 pts**	**8.333 pts**	**7 pts**

	A - Cost	A-1 - cost
Reviewer	**/ 30 pts**	**/ 30 pts**
Johanna Taylor	-	-
Anita Clark	-	-
john King	-	-
Average:	**Average:**	**-**
		↓
Calculated:	**-**	**-**

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Proposal Score Comments

La Boit Specialty Vehicles, Inc. - Scoring Comments

Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	12 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Addresses all specifications, detailed
Anita Clark	15 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Exactly what we were looking to purchase
john King	15 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	exactly identifies with rfp

Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	48 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	All specifications addressed. The pass through from the cab to the clinic is a strength of this design.
Anita Clark	45 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Product and presentation great.
john King	50 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	exactly identifies with rfp

Ability and Customer Service - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	4 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Extended warranty; downside is long build time
Anita Clark	4 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Meets are standard and like the additional warranty package
john King	5 pts	High level of detail in response	exactly identifies with rfp and local parts and service

Relevant Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	8 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	experienced with mobile medical units, unsure other clients
Anita Clark	10 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Strong local company operating since 1981
john King	10 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	local business in business since 1981

Schedule and Delivery - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	6 pts	Doesn't meet my expectations	7-8 month build time
Anita Clark	18 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Clear in outlining order/deliver of 7-8 months.

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
john King	19 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	exactly identifies with rfp

A-1 - cost - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	28 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Comprehensive quote, high value for quoted cost and meets all specifications.
john King	20 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	high

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

Quality Vans & Specialty Vehicles - Scoring Comments (Eliminated)

Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	12 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	Overall specifications met
Anita Clark	12 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	meets most expectations
john King	13 pts	High level of detail in response	Proposed scope of work detailed perfectly

Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	45 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Meets required specifications; will need to further address/discuss optional features

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Anita Clark	40 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Sufficient design.
john King	40 pts	High level of detail in response	very close to what we are looking for in the rfp

Ability and Customer Service - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	3 pts	Partially meets my expectations	Long build times, Need additional information regarding certified service providers
Anita Clark	4 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Good customer service
john King	3 pts	Partially meets my expectations	just not local for parts and service and not exactly what we are looking for

Relevant Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Significant experience building mobile health units.
Anita Clark	8 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Strong knowledge in product
john King	8 pts	High level of detail in response	Close to what we want just not exact and not local

Schedule and Delivery - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	5 pts	Doesn't meet my expectations	Requires delivery from out of state. Listed up to 290 days to built unit after procurement of chassis.
Anita Clark	5 pts	Incomplete response	I could not find any exact turnaround time for this product

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
john King	10 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	about 10 month delivery not local

A-1 - cost - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Anita Clark	25 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	A bit more than expected but aware of additional requests desired

Farber Specialty Vehicles - Scoring Comments (Eliminated)

Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	12 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	Specifications are addressed, overall some lack of detail; Price is included
Anita Clark	13 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Points deducted as no timeline included.
john King	12 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Short response needed a little more detail

Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	45 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Design and layout, design drawings consistent with specifications
Anita Clark	45 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Great looking product
john King	35 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	needed a little more detail

Ability and Customer Service - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	3 pts	Medium level of detail in response	Not completely addressed in proposal
Anita Clark	4 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Very professionally presented
john King	5 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	long term customer and local

Relevant Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	list of other healthcare clients impressive
Anita Clark	9 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	100 years of experience
john King	9 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	long term customer and local

Schedule and Delivery - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	7 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	6 month build
Anita Clark	10 pts	Medium level of detail in response	Did not find any specific detail on product delivery timeline
john King	10 pts	Partially meets my expectations	don't know final delivery expectation

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

CT DEFENSE - Scoring Comments (Eliminated)

Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	0 pts	Incomplete response	This proposal does not meet the basic level of information required in the proposal. There are no specifications for a mobile health unit or services.
Anita Clark	2 pts	Doesn't meet my expectations	Designs were not specific to our clinic needs for a mobile unit
john King	0 pts	Poor level of detail in response	did not provide detail on item needed

Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	0 pts	Missing / mismatched attributes	This proposal does not include specifications for a mobile health unit or how one of the company's units could be converted into a mobile health unit to meet specifications. There is a significant amount of missing information and specifications.
Anita Clark	10 pts	Doesn't meet my expectations	Doesn't not meet our clinical needs
john King	0 pts	Poor level of detail in response	did not provide detail on item needed

Ability and Customer Service - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	0 pts	Incomplete response	Customer service not addressed in any relevant detail in proposal.

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Anita Clark	1 pts	Poor level of detail in response	Doesn't have much on service/timeline of project.
john King	1 pts	Poor level of detail in response	did not provide detail on item needed

Relevant Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	2 pts	Doesn't meet my expectations	Although it is clear that this company has significant experience building mobile tactical style units, it is not clear what their experience with mobile health units may be based on this proposal.
Anita Clark	5 pts	Partially meets my expectations	Relevant Defense experience of 39 years

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
john King	1 pts	Poor level of detail in response	did not provide detail on item needed

Schedule and Delivery - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	0 pts	Incomplete response	Schedule and delivery not addressed in this proposal.
Anita Clark	1 pts	Incomplete response	No detail on timeline of delivery.
john King	0 pts	Poor level of detail in response	did not provide detail on item needed

esec corp dba Columbus Peterbilt - Scoring Comments (Eliminated)

Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	Partially meets my expectations	Although this is a detailed response, it is lengthy - exceeds recommended page limits
Anita Clark	5 pts	Medium level of detail in response	Not what we were looking for no complete pictures of mobile unit
john King	8 pts	Other	157 pages

Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	45 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	Thorough listing of all required/preferred specifications.

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			Cab is separate from clinic space.
Anita Clark	10 pts	Doesn't meet my expectations	No finished product
john King	29 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	different than asked for

Ability and Customer Service - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	5 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Clearly addresses availability of supplies and personnel to complete project
Anita Clark	1 pts	Incomplete response	Found multiple pages non-applicable to RFP.
john King	4 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	long term customer local

Relevant Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Significant experience in building mobile units, including staff experienced in mobile medical units
Anita Clark	6 pts	Mostly complete response	Looks to be experienced
john King	7 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	long term support but haven't worked with body provider

Schedule and Delivery - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	19 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Unit can be built within 90 days of procuring chassis (7 days).
Anita Clark	2 pts	Incomplete response	Did not find any delivery date information

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
john King	17 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	short delivery time

THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

LDV Inc. - Scoring Comments (Eliminated)

Specification Conformity and Completeness of Response - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	Medium level of detail in response	Overall missing some detail
Anita Clark	10 pts	High level of detail in response	good response and detail
john King	13 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	very close with nice upgrades

Sufficiency of Design, Layout and Equipment - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	45 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Design meets specifications
Anita Clark	40 pts	High level of detail in response	Would have liked a color picture with detail of Mobile Unit

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
john King	34 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	would have like to seen summary answered as asked

Ability and Customer Service - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	4 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	Local service centers included, staffing detail and capability included.
Anita Clark	3 pts	Mostly complete response	Adequate response
john King	3 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	just not local

Relevant Experience - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	9 pts	Well-supported claim(s)	Experienced mobile unit builder, achievements listed
Anita Clark	8 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Strong history of service in this industry.
john King	8 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	just not local

Schedule and Delivery - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Johanna Taylor	2 pts	Doesn't meet my expectations	I don't see any detail related to timeline (as far as total build time). There are some concerns in the performance evaluations related to timeline as well.
Anita Clark	10 pts	Partially meets my expectations	Not clear on turnaround time for product

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
john King	9 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	Never committed to final delivery time