

# RFQ009691 - Sprayliner Truck and Equipment RFP

## Project Overview

Project Details	
Reference ID	RFQ009691
Project Name	Sprayliner Truck and Equipment RFP
Project Owner	Roblyn Slaughter
Project Type	RFP
Department	Finance
Budget	\$0.00 - \$0.00
Project Description	<p>1.0 SCOPE AND CLASSIFICATION 1.1 Scope: The City of Columbus, Department of Finance and Management, Purchasing Office, is seeking Request for Proposals (RFPs) to provide the City with a contract for one (1) diesel powered cab and chassis truck with long line pavement marking equipment (also referred to as a Sprayliner in the remainder of the specifications). The Sprayliner will be used by the Department of Public Service, Division of Traffic Management. The City is seeking proposals from responsible contractors capable of providing the needed equipment. The contract term shall be negotiated. The City expects to complete procurement activities in 2018 with expected delivery of the specialized equipment in early 2019. 1.2 Classification: Offerors are encouraged to submit proposals that demonstrate their competence, ability, past performance, quality and feasibility, cost, and environmental impact as defined in this request. The City may contract with one or more Offerors chosen through this RFP process. 1.3 Specification Questions: Questions regarding this RFP (Best Value) must be submitted on the portal by 11:00 am on Thursday, July 26, 2018. Responses and any</p>

	necessary addenda will be posted as an amendment to this RFP on the portal no later than Tuesday, July 31, 2018 at 4:00p.m.
<b>Open Date</b>	Jul 12, 2018 11:00 AM EDT
<b>Close Date</b>	Aug 16, 2018 11:00 AM EDT

Highest Scoring Supplier	Score
<b>MRL Equipment</b>	<b>113.5 pts</b>

## 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[iii] 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](http://www.ethics.ohio.gov/education/factsheets/full_outline_of_the_ohio_ethics_law.pdf)

Name	Date Signed	Has a Conflict of Interest?
Roblyn Slaughter	Aug 16, 2018 3:07 PM EDT	No
Joshua Davis	Aug 27, 2018 8:46 AM EDT	No
Andrew Volenik	Aug 29, 2018 9:29 AM EDT	No
Christopher Adams	Aug 17, 2018 9:58 AM EDT	No

## Signatures

Name	Signatures
<b>Roblyn Slaughter</b> (Project Owner)	
<b>Joshua Davis</b> (Evaluator)	
<b>Andrew Volenik</b> (Evaluator)	
<b>Christopher Adams</b> (Evaluator)	

## Questions and Answers

No messages

## Public Notices

No messages

## Internal Discussions

No messages



## Submissions

Supplier	Date Submitted	Name	Email	Confirmation Code
MRL Equipment	Aug 15, 2018 7:08 PM EDT	Liz Harding	info@markritelines.com	MjkzNjY=
M-B Companies, Inc.	Aug 16, 2018 10:37 AM EDT	Desiree Mausteller-Arbogast	dmausteller-arbogast@m-bco.com	MjkzODk=

## Project Criteria

Criteria	Points	Description
Competence	10 pts	
Quality and Feasability	60 pts	
Ability	5 pts	
Past Performance	20 pts	
Environmentally preferable factor	5 pts	
<b>A - Cost</b>	<b>30 pts</b>	
A-1 - Proposal with Secondary Propulsion System	30 pts	
A-2 - Proposal w/out Secondary Propulsion System	30 pts	

<b>Total</b>	<b>130 pts</b>	
--------------	----------------	--

## Scoring Summary

### Active Submissions

	Total	Competence	Quality and Feasability	Ability	Past Performance
Supplier	/ 130 pts	/ 10 pts	/ 60 pts	/ 5 pts	/ 20 pts
MRL Equipment	113.5 pts	10 pts	57.33 pts	5 pts	18 pts

	Environmentally preferable factor	A - Cost	A-1 - Proposal with Secondary Propulsion System	A-2 - Proposal w/out Secondary Propulsion System
Supplier	/ 5 pts	/ 30 pts*	/ 30 pts	/ 30 pts
MRL Equipment	4 pts	19.17 pts	8.333 pts	30 pts

## Eliminated Submissions

	Competence	Quality and Feasability	Ability	Past Performance	Environmentally preferable factor
Supplier	/ 10 pts	/ 60 pts	/ 5 pts	/ 20 pts	/ 5 pts
M-B Companies, Inc.	5.333 pts	31.67 pts	3.333 pts	11.67 pts	4.333 pts

	A - Cost	A-1 - Proposal with Secondary Propulsion System	A-2 - Proposal w/out Secondary Propulsion System
Supplier	/ 30 pts*	/ 30 pts	/ 30 pts
M-B Companies, Inc.	-	-	-

## Reason

Supplier	Disqualified by	Reason
M-B Companies, Inc.	Roblyn Slaughter	The evaluation committee has scored and decided to no longer consider this offeror's proposal for an award.

## Proposal Scores

### MRL Equipment - Scoring Summary

#### Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Total	Competence	Quality and Feasability	Ability	Past Performance
Reviewer	/ 100 pts	/ 10 pts	/ 60 pts	/ 5 pts	/ 20 pts
Joshua Davis	97 pts	10 pts	60 pts	5 pts	17 pts
Andrew Volenik	88 pts	10 pts	52 pts	5 pts	17 pts
Christopher Adams	98 pts	10 pts	60 pts	5 pts	20 pts
	<b>Average:</b>	<b>10 pts</b>	<b>57.33 pts</b>	<b>5 pts</b>	<b>18 pts</b>

		↓	↓	↓	↓
<b>Calculated:</b>	<b>94.33 pts</b>	<b>10 pts</b>	<b>57.33 pts</b>	<b>5 pts</b>	<b>18 pts</b>

	<b>Environmentally preferable factor</b>
<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>/ 5 pts</b>
Joshua Davis	5 pts
Andrew Volenik	4 pts
Christopher Adams	3 pts
	<b>4 pts</b>
	↓
<b>Calculated:</b>	<b>4 pts</b>



## Evaluation Group 2 - Cost

	Total	A - Cost	A-1 - Proposal with Secondary Propulsion System	A-2 - Proposal w/out Secondary Propulsion System
Reviewer	/ 30 pts	/ 30 pts*	/ 30 pts	/ 30 pts
Joshua Davis	20 pts	20 pts	10 pts	30 pts
Andrew Volenik	22.5 pts	22.5 pts	15 pts	30 pts
Christopher Adams	15 pts	15 pts	0 pts	30 pts
		Average:	8.333 pts	30 pts
			↓	↓
Calculated:	19.17 pts	19.17 pts	8.333 pts	30 pts

\* - Denotes the group weight has been overridden.



## M-B Companies, Inc. - Scoring Summary (Eliminated)

### Evaluation Group 1 - Main Evaluation

	Competence	Quality and Feasibility	Ability	Past Performance	Environmentally preferable factor
Reviewer	/ 10 pts	/ 60 pts	/ 5 pts	/ 20 pts	/ 5 pts
Joshua Davis	5 pts	35 pts	5 pts	13 pts	5 pts
Andrew Volenik	6 pts	35 pts	3 pts	12 pts	5 pts
Christopher Adams	5 pts	25 pts	2 pts	10 pts	3 pts
<b>Average:</b>	<b>5.333 pts</b>	<b>31.67 pts</b>	<b>3.333 pts</b>	<b>11.67 pts</b>	<b>4.333 pts</b>
	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
<b>Calculated:</b>	<b>5.333 pts</b>	<b>31.67 pts</b>	<b>3.333 pts</b>	<b>11.67 pts</b>	<b>4.333 pts</b>

## Evaluation Group 2 - Cost

	A - Cost	A-1 - Proposal with Secondary Propulsion System	A-2 - Proposal w/out Secondary Propulsion System
Reviewer	/ 30 pts*	/ 30 pts	/ 30 pts
Joshua Davis	-	-	-
Andrew Volenik	-	-	-
Christopher Adams	-	-	-
	Average:	-	-
		↓	↓
Calculated:	-	-	-

\* - Denotes the group weight has been overridden.



## Proposal Score Comments

### MRL Equipment - Scoring Comments

#### Competence - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	10 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	MRL in company history and team available listed years of experience and details of employees. Likewise, I liked the part in "MRL Company History" where they make 90 - 100 pavement marking trucks per year and 460 thermoplastic trucks since 1989.
Christopher Adams	10 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Sprayliners and line marking equipment are the only items they manufacture and offer for sale, I like that fact, that tells me they are

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			pretty committed to that industry only. I really like the fact that they can give us local support thru another one of their customers (Griffin) if needed, if they have that kind of relationship with their customer base that says a lot about them.
Joshua Davis	10 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	The Offeror meets or exceeds my expectations with the technical training, education and experience of the company's personnel assigned to perform the work.

## Quality and Feasability - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	52 pts	Other	The MRL presentation per the RFP

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			was very good and answered all of the major points of the RFP. It would be beneficial to have seen engineering/shop drawings of the vehicle with parts numbered/labeled. These lacking details subtracted from a perfect score, but overall was an understandable and appropriate presentation.
Christopher Adams	60 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Was very impressed with the scale of details the rep knew off of the top of his head, could really tell he knew a lot about the product he was trying to sell.
Joshua Davis	60 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	The Offeror meets or exceeds my expectations with its ability to demonstrate their compliance with the needs in the technical specifications.



## Ability - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	5 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Per the provided submission, it appears that MRL has the appropriate ability to not only build, but manage the planning of, building, and delivery of the long liner. I liked how they specified weekly meetings to discuss with City staff progress of the long liner.
Christopher Adams	5 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Was very impressed during presentation with the scale of their manufacturing and parts facility.
Joshua Davis	5 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	The Offeror meets or exceeds my expectations with the ability to perform the required service competently and expeditiously.

## Past Performance - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	17 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	MRL had very high marks from previous projects. Further, per past projects with the City, MRL has a good reputation and delivered equipment in a timely and effective manner.
Christopher Adams	20 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Was very impressed during presentation about the prior projects they have completed.
Joshua Davis	17 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	The Offeror Meets or exceeds my expectations by scoring in the highly in all on the performance questionnaire. The Division of Traffic Management likes the specific engine/equipment the company included on its proposal.

## Environmentally preferable factor - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	4 pts	Other	MRL seems to meet the needed requirements for being environmentally conscience but I saw no reference to CNG.
Christopher Adams	3 pts	Partially meets my expectations	There were only a few things mentioned during presentation about environmentally friendly procedures and practices.
Joshua Davis	5 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	The Offeror meets or exceeds my expectations with its use of environmental practices.

## A-1 - Proposal with Secondary Propulsion System - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
----------	-------	--------	----------

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	15 pts	Partially supported claim(s)	Does not meet operational need
Christopher Adams	0 pts	Other	Division doesn't do enough long line striping to justify extra expense.
Joshua Davis	10 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	More expensive and not necessary

## A-2 - Proposal w/out Secondary Propulsion System - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	30 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Meets operational need
Christopher Adams	30 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	Division doesn't really do enough long line striping to justify extra expense.

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Joshua Davis	30 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	Less expensive option and closer to what we want.

## M-B Companies, Inc. - Scoring Comments (Eliminated)

### Competence - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	6 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	M-B Companies has been in this business for sometime, but it appears that striping has been a fully functioning operations since 2004 upon the acquisition of Marking Equipment Division, formerly LDI. The timeline is a bit complicated to know when/how M-B was a leader in pavement marking equipment. I would like to have had the names and personal work history of staff that will be assisting the City in the process. Descriptions were too general and hard to gauge real competencies of staff.

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			Adjusted score based on interview 11/7/18.
Christopher Adams	5 pts	Partially fits desired attributes	Sprayliner vehicles are only a small percentage of their overall business, worried about service after the sale.
Joshua Davis	5 pts	Medium level of detail in response	The Offeror may not be able to support us with the technical training, education and experience of the company's personnel assigned to perform the work. Also, I am not sure if the offeror will have enough techs to provide the service we would need.

## Quality and Feasability - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	35 pts	Other	<p>Overall, the presentation of this information was easy to understand and answered much of the RFP specifications. There are some lacking details I would have preferred to have M-B dive into with their report e.g. 3.5.2.3.3 per RFP "heavy-duty, rear mounted gun carriage assemblies with auto-lift..." I was unable to confirm auto-lift feature. Some specifications were general "one sheet" specs provided by other vendors. Would have liked to see where on vehicle some of the more detailed information is located, etc. Overall, the presentation was palatable but lacked some of those desired details.</p> <p>MB Interview on 11/7/18:</p> <p>Per the interview with MB</p>



Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
			employees, I am scoring MB lower on their Quality and Feasibility, notably, the feasibility and after service section. From the interview, MB solutions would try to provide the best services, but does not seem to be set to be the best at executing after service. Technicians are minimal for such a large operation.
Christopher Adams	25 pts	Partially supported claim(s)	Was not very impressed the "creep drive" they offered to meet our low speed requirements.
Joshua Davis	35 pts	Medium level of detail in response	I am worried about the customer service that we will receive from the MB and the lead time for the parts we would need for the truck.

## Ability - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	3 pts	Partially supported claim(s)	<p>I would really like to see more detail in the processes listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inspection/testing process</li> <li>- on-site training - how much is available? As needed?</li> </ul>
Christopher Adams	2 pts	Partially supported claim(s)	<p>In presentation they seemed to focus on all the other things they manufactured instead of the one piece equipment we were interested in purchasing.</p>
Joshua Davis	5 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	<p>The Offeror meets or exceeds my expectations with the ability to perform the required service competently and expeditiously.</p>

## Past Performance - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	12 pts	Other	M-B seems to have satisfied customers; however, the City of Columbus had many issues with the previous M-B unit, requiring numerous post acquisition fixes, meetings, and too much downtime for the piece of equipment.
Christopher Adams	10 pts	Partially supported claim(s)	The company was bought out last July, so past performance results will most likely not be what we will be getting if we purchase from them, they seemed uncertain in which direction they were heading with the new management, that makes me a little hesitate.
Joshua Davis	13 pts	Medium level of detail in response	The MB sprayliner the City has is not the best functioning truck.

## Environmentally preferable factor - Reviewer Scores

Reviewer	Score	Reason	Comments
Andrew Volenik	5 pts	Strongly fits desired attribute(s)	CNG option is available.
Christopher Adams	3 pts	Other	Was not very impressed with the environmental presentation, other than the LED light conversion everything else was really vague.
Joshua Davis	5 pts	Meets or exceeds my expectations	The Offeror meets or exceeds my expectations with its use of environmental practices

