SU FY13 Vote #11 June 19, 2013

Vendor	Region	Renewal/New	Renewal Options	PBC	Type of Service	Individuals Employed	Agency	Address	City	Begin Term	End Term	Annual Contract Value	Total Contract Value
Bridgeway, Inc	N	N	N	13-76861	Data Entry	29	HFS	900 S Deer Rd	Macomb	07/01/13	06/30/16	$2,000,000.00	$6,000,000.00
Chicago Lighthouse	N	N	N	13-79332	Data Entry	10	DHS	1850 W Roosevelt Rd	Chicago	07/01/13	06/30/14	$201,000.00	$201,000.00
Chicago Lighthouse	N	N	N	13-79650	Call Center	12	DOI	1850 W Roosevelt Rd	Chicago	07/01/13	06/30/14	$4,480,930.00	$4,480,930.00
Elm City Rehab	S	R	N	12-71393	Tooth Products	10	CMS	on site	Jacksonville	07/01/13	06/30/14	$114,154.00	$114,154.00
Human Service Ctr	S	N	N	N/A	Bakery Mixes	70	CMS/various	on site	Red Bud	07/01/13	12/31/13	$791,672.76	$791,672.76
Kreider Services	N	N	N	13-78692	Food Services	10	DHS	1120 Washington Ave	Dixon	07/01/13	6/31/14	$22,000.00	$22,000.00
Rave, Inc.	S	N	N	13-79277	Janitorial	3	DHS/ORS	1000 N. Main St	Anna	07/01/13	06/30/14	$19,390.00	$19,390.00
Village of Progress	N	R	N	13-59289	Janitorial	4	DHS	1120 Washington Ave	Dixon	07/01/13	06/30/14	$320,000.00	$320,000.00
N* is a brand new contract					Total	**148**					Total	**$7,949,146.76**	**$11,949,146.76**

Fair Market Price -- The Illinois Procurement Code requires that qualified sheltered workshops offer a fair market price to state agencies in order to meet specific needs for supplies and services. As not-for-profit organizations, pricing offers developed by workshops are designed to cover costs. In turn, state agencies ensure prices offered by sheltered workshops (often through negotiation) are acceptable (from a budgetary perspective) and are comparable to those paid historically or those paid for similar contracts. When considering contract proposals, the State Use Committee not only takes into account the development process of the pricing offer, but also considers the intent of the State Use program -- to promote employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. Further, under a total cost of ownership model, the Committee considers the fact that if these individuals were not given this opportunity, they would be forced to be supported by other social service programs, thus costing the State additional monies.

On June 19, 2013 the State Use Committee met and reviewed the above contract proposals. As a member of the Committee, I have reviewed these proposals and have determined, based on the facts presented, both above and in discussion with the other Committee members and with the State Use staff, that the prices offered are reasonable and would not be substantially more if this procurement were to be competitively bid. **FAX to Corrie Smith at 217-558-1759**

Signature of Member

Date