

Award Justification Statement

Solicitation #RA25-65

OUTDOOR DIGITAL SCOREBOARD W/ DELAY OF GAME CLOCKS

I. Result

Box Elder School District has determined Digital Scoreboards as the highest scoring, responsive and responsible offeror and will be awarded the contract for Box Elder School Districts Outdoor Digital Scoreboard RA25-65.

II. Evaluation Process

A request for proposals (RFP) was issued by the State to select a vendor to provide Outdoor Digital Scoreboard with Delay of Game Clocks including setup, training, warranty and support service as well as general maintenance for Bear River High School. Pursuant to Utah Code § 63G-6a-702(2), the RFP process was used because criteria other than cost were considered important in determining which vendor's proposal provides the best value to the State.

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with Part 7 of the Utah Procurement Code by an Evaluation Committee comprised of subject matter experts from teachers, coaches, athletic directors, business office member and a community member. A representative from the Division of State Purchasing was consulted throughout the process to ensure Procurement Code compliance but was not a voting member of the Evaluation Committee.

Stage 1 Mandatory Minimum Requirements

This RFP received 10 submissions. Following evaluation of Stage 1 Initial Review/Mandatory Minimum Requirements all vendors were advanced to Stage 2, Written Technical Proposal Evaluation.

Stage 2 Written Technical Proposal Evaluation

Stage 2 final average scores determined by the evaluation committee for each technical criteria category can be found in Attachment A.

III. Proposal Evaluation Conclusion

Of a possible 100 points in this evaluation stage, Digital Scoreboards scored 97.33 points.

V. Conclusion

This RFP was conducted as a single contract award to the responsive and responsible Offeror with the highest total score. Of a possible 100 points for the Technical Evaluation Digital Scoreboard scored 97.33 points. Based on the justifications outlined above, it is the opinion of

the State Evaluation Committee that award of a contract to Digital Scoreboards provides the best value to the State.

See Attachment A –(Below)

Total Vendor Points											
	Points Possible	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D	Vendor E	Vendor F	Vendor G	Vendor H	Vendor I	Vendor J
A1-Vendors history & experience in Outdoor Scoreboards	15	12.17	14.83	9.33	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.67	14.67	14.67
A2-Quality and Durability of Proposed Scoreboard System	20	17.17	19.33	14.33	16.50	18.00	16.50	17.00	17.67	17.67	17.67
A3- Warranty, Customer Support, and Training Services	15	10.67	15.00	8.33	12.17	12.17	12.17	12.17	11.50	11.50	11.50
A4-Proposed Timeline for Delivery and Installation	10	7.50	10.00	2.33	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50	9.50
A5- Software Quality, Ease of Use, and Reputation	15	11.67	14.33	9.50	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.00	12.67	12.83
A6- Addition Value Beyond RFP Requirements	5	3.50	4.50	2.17	2.50	3.00	2.50	3.33	4.00	3.67	3.67
A7- Cost-Effectiveness	15	8.00	14.83	9.83	6.17	10.00	6.17	10.00	9.50	9.50	10.17
A8- References from Similar Installations	5	2.17	4.50	1.67	4.17	4.17	4.17	4.17	4.67	4.67	4.67
Total Points	100	72.83	97.33	57.50	79.00	84.83	79.00	84.17	84.50	83.83	84.67
Ranking		8	1	9	6	2	6	5	4	6	3