



PUBLIC-SECTOR PROCUREMENT INTELLIGENCE CASE STUDY

City of Ann Arbor RFP 18-20

Digital Scanning Services for Permits, Plans and Projects

Why this case study is different

This Demo 3 uses an actual City of Ann Arbor solicitation and separates the analysis into time-bound stages. Part I freezes the evidence at the May 3, 2018 proposal deadline and asks what a careful bidder or procurement analyst could have identified before award. Part II then documents the procurement outcome and uses later public records only to test whether those pre-award risk signals proved material. Later outcomes are not used to retroactively improve the original analysis.

Historical Demonstration Engagement | Ex-Ante Analysis + Post-Award Validation | September 2026

Executive Summary

KeenVector analyzed City of Ann Arbor RFP 18-20 as a historical procurement-intelligence case using an explicit evidence firewall. The bid-stage analysis uses only the 2018 RFP and Addendum No. 1 — information available by the proposal deadline. The City sought a vendor to convert a large legacy collection of paper, 16mm microfilm, and microfiche into digital records for later loading into OnBase. [S2][S3]

At bid stage, the procurement clearly rewarded execution quality over headline price. The official evaluation assigned 50 points to the Proposed Work Plan, 20 to Professional Qualifications, 20 to Similar Projects, and 10 to Fee; the RFP also stated that fee proposals would not be reviewed during the initial evaluation. That structure makes scope control, custody, indexing, mixed-media handling, retrieval continuity, OCR limitations, and throughput planning central to a defensible response. [S2]

Procurement fact	Documented value
Bid-stage evidence freeze	RFP 18-20 + Addendum No. 1 only for ex-ante analysis [S2][S3]
Estimated volume	3,686,500 pages (RFP estimate) [S2]
Evaluation emphasis	Work Plan 50 / Qualifications 20 / Similar Projects 20 / Fee 10 [S2]
Procurement outcome	Eight offerors recorded; tentative award listed to Layton [S1][S4]
Post-award validation	2019 City record says Building/Rental volume was significantly greater than originally estimated [S5]

Pre-award analytical finding

Using only 2018 bid-stage evidence, the dominant procurement risk was not simply scanning price. It was inventory uncertainty and execution control: custody, record retrieval while originals were offsite, mixed and deteriorating media, metadata/indexing from incomplete source inventories, OCR feasibility, scheduling, and exception handling. [S2][S3]

Only after completing the ex-ante analysis does this case study open the outcome record. The official proposal tab records eight offerors, the City procurement index lists a tentative award to Layton Document Systems, and a 2019 council amendment later states that the Building/Rental portion contained far more material needing indexing and scanning than originally estimated. [S1][S4][S5]

The hindsight record is used as a validation test, not as a substitute for foresight. The additional \$83,555.08 base request was approximately 52.9% of the original \$158,094.98 base amount for that portion, while the same City memo stated there were no additional or unexpected fees or charges from Layton and reported strong pace and scan quality. KeenVector does not treat those amounts as the final cost of the entire RFP or infer why Layton won. [S5]

PART I — BID-STAGE / EX-ANTE PROCUREMENT INTELLIGENCE

Evidence cutoff: May 3, 2018 proposal deadline. This part uses S2 (RFP) and S3 (Addendum No. 1) only. No award result, later funding change, or vendor-performance information is allowed to influence the risk model.

1. Scope Decomposition

The original RFP quantified four approximate media groups. KeenVector reconstructed the total only from the City's own unit estimates; no external page assumptions are used. [S2]

Media / location	Units	Pages / unit	Estimated pages	Share
Large-format paper — City Hall	3,780	20	75,600	2.1%
Large-format paper — Fire Station #2	6,286	20	125,720	3.4%
16mm microfilm — City Hall	1,025 rolls	2,812	2,882,300	78.2%
Microfiche — City Hall	15,072 jackets	40	602,880	16.4%
TOTAL			3,686,500	100.0%

Operational requirements extracted from the RFP

- Create digital scans at 300 dpi minimum and searchable PDF format, subject to technical feasibility clarified later in Addendum 1. [S2][S3]
- Maintain check-out/check-in status so the City can locate records while they are transported, scanned, and returned. [S2]
- Preserve page size and page order; create an inventory spreadsheet with City-defined metadata fields. [S2]
- Return completed digital files, original paper/microfilm/microfiche, and the completed digital inventory. [S2]

Addendum details that materially changed estimating

- Grayscale was acceptable even where originals contained color. [S3]
- Film was described as fair, some cartridges difficult to reel, older paper might require flattening, and acetate film showed more deterioration than fiche. [S3]
- Only part of the paper inventory existed electronically; other indexing data lived in hard-copy binders and index cards. [S3]
- The City allowed alternative workflows and did not prescribe a completion timeline; vendors were expected to propose their own schedule. [S3]
- Searchable PDF was required where possible, but the City acknowledged that OCR might not be feasible for every source and did not require OCR re-keying/correction. [S3]

2. Submission Compliance & Evaluation Strategy

Hard compliance gates

Requirement	Consequence / importance	Source
Attachments B, C, and D completed and included	RFP/Addendum state omission would make proposal non-responsive	S2/S3
Addendum No. 1 acknowledged	Proposal could be considered non-conforming	S3
Fee proposal separated from technical proposal	Required by evaluation structure; fee kept in separate sealed envelope	S2
One original, three proposal copies, one digital PDF copy	Specified submission package	S2
Proposal valid at least 90 days	Explicit commercial condition	S2
Use designated City contacts only	Improper influence contact could lead to elimination	S2
30-sheet / 60-side response limit excluding attachments/resumes	Forced concise proposal architecture	S2

Official scoring model

Criterion	Points	Share	Response implication
Professional Qualifications	20	20%	Name the actual team, qualifications, subcontractors, and technical fit.
Past Similar Projects	20	20%	Provide directly analogous experience and referenceable clients.
Proposed Work Plan	50	50%	Explain execution in depth: custody, media handling, indexing, QC, retrieval, delivery, schedule, coordination.
Fee Proposal	10	10%	Provide a defensible cost model; price alone was not the dominant factor.

KeenVector bid implication

The Work Plan carried five times the points of Fee, and fee proposals were withheld from the initial evaluation. A rational bidder should therefore spend disproportionate effort proving execution control, not merely lowering headline price. [S2]

3. Addendum Intelligence & Risk Register

Addendum No. 1 contained 73 questions and answers. Several clarifications materially affected cost, scheduling, custody, and technical assumptions. [S3]

Issue	City clarification	KeenVector interpretation
Record access	Originals generally expected back within 4–5 business days depending on batch size; electronic copies could satisfy requests.	A retrieval SLA and traceable custody workflow were part of the service design.
Pricing	City wanted an estimated total project cost and encouraged staff-class rates.	Pricing required explicit assumptions and change-control logic.
Tracking	Box-level tracking was acceptable if the City knew the record range removed.	A range-based custody log could reduce intake burden without losing accountability.
Metadata	Only part of the collection had electronic inventory; other metadata came from binders/cards.	Manual indexing and reconciliation were meaningful labor and QA risks.
Media condition	Film fair/difficult to reel; older paper might need flattening; acetate film showed deterioration.	Media-specific prep and exception handling were necessary.
Schedule / workflow	No fixed completion date; alternative workflow allowed; vendor to propose schedule.	Schedule and methodology were competitive differentiators, but had to preserve access and quality.

KeenVector risk prioritization

Risk	Analyst priority	Control design
Inventory / volume uncertainty	25 / 25	Document assumptions, sample before scale, unit-rate logic, change control, and reforecast gates.
Metadata / indexing complexity	20 / 25	Define source hierarchy, keying rules, exception queue, and validation sample.
Fragile / deteriorated media	16 / 25	Media-specific prep SOP, non-destructive handling, damage exception log.
Schedule / throughput	16 / 25	Media-segment throughput model, pilot benchmark, capacity buffer, progress reporting.
Custody / retrieval continuity	15 / 25	Range tracking, secure transport, retrieval SLA, digital-request workaround.

The priority scores above are KeenVector analyst judgments built only from 2018 RFP/Addendum evidence, not City ratings. They are frozen before reviewing later outcomes. Their purpose is to convert bid-stage evidence into an explicit response-risk model without disguising hindsight as foresight.

PART II — PROCUREMENT OUTCOME & POST-AWARD VALIDATION

This part opens later evidence only after the ex-ante analysis is fixed. S1/S4 document procurement outcome; S5 is used to test whether pre-award risk signals later appeared in the public record.

4. Post-Award Validation (Hindsight Test)

This section does not rescore the 2018 analysis or reconstruct the City's award rationale. It asks only whether later public records show that major risks identified from the 2018 RFP/Addendum actually mattered.

Pre-award risk	2018 evidence signal	Later public record / validation
Inventory / volume uncertainty	Approximate quantities; several detailed inventory characteristics unknown. [S2][S3]	REALIZED — 2019 memo says Building/Rental volume needing indexing/scanning was far greater than originally estimated. [S5]
Metadata / indexing complexity	Only limited electronic inventory; other metadata depended on binders/cards. [S3]	PARTIALLY SUPPORTED — later memo ties added need to more information requiring indexing/scanning, but does not isolate metadata labor. [S5]
Schedule / throughput	No fixed completion deadline; vendor had to propose schedule for mixed multimillion-page scope. [S3]	MANAGED SUCCESSFULLY — 2019 memo reports excellent pace. This does not mean schedule risk was absent at bid stage. [S5]
Media condition / handling	Aging paper, fair film, difficult cartridges, acetate deterioration. [S3]	NOT OBSERVED IN SOURCE SET — no later damage/handling failure is documented in the outcome records used here.
Custody / retrieval continuity	City required tracking and practical retrieval while originals were offsite. [S2][S3]	NOT OBSERVED IN SOURCE SET — no later custody/retrieval failure is documented; absence of a record is not proof none occurred.

Hindsight validation — what the case actually demonstrates

The strongest ex-ante signal — uncertainty in the physical inventory and resulting indexing/scanning volume — later materialized in the City's own amendment record. Other risks were either positively managed or cannot be validated from the public source set. This distinguishes realized risk, managed risk, and unobserved risk instead of claiming every pre-award concern came true.

For the Building/Rental portion, the 2019 City memorandum states that the amount of material needing indexing and scanning was far greater than originally estimated. The additional \$83,555.08 base request equals approximately 52.9% of the original \$158,094.98 base amount for that portion; combined, those two base appropriations total \$241,650.06. That arithmetic is a KeenVector calculation from City-published amounts, not a claim about the final cost of the entire RFP. [S5]

What is deliberately not claimed

- No evaluator score sheets were in the public source set, so this report does not claim how Layton or any competitor scored. [S1][S4][S5]
- No claim is made that Layton had the lowest price or that price determined the award.
- No revised final page count is invented; the amendment says volume was greater but does not provide a complete revised page total. [S5]
- No final acceptance report is claimed; the 2019 council memorandum is treated as a progress update, not a final independent audit. [S5]

5. Source Register & Analytical Boundaries

Ref	Official source	Use in analysis
S1	City of Ann Arbor — 2018 Request for Proposals index [Part II: outcome]	RFP title, status, due date, tentative award to Layton
S2	City of Ann Arbor — RFP 18-20 [Part I: bid-stage evidence]	Scope, quantities, output requirements, evaluation weights, submission rules
S3	City of Ann Arbor — Addendum No. 1 [Part I: bid-stage evidence]	73 Q&As; custody, pricing, media condition, OCR, metadata, schedule, alternatives
S4	City of Ann Arbor — Proposal Opening Tabulation [Part II: post-submission outcome]	Eight offerors recorded at opening
S5	City of Ann Arbor — File 19-1980 / R-19-508 [Part II: post-award validation]	Prior Layton agreement, funding increase, volume underestimate, performance update

Official URLs

S1: <https://www.a2gov.org/finance-and-administrative-services/purchasing/request-for-proposals-2018/>

S2: https://media-001-us.cdn.govstack.com/a2gov-002-us/media/n5vfmc1c/rfp_18-20_document.pdf

S3: https://www.a2gov.org/media/wyqpydf1/rfp_18-20_addendum1.pdf

S4: https://media-001-us.cdn.govstack.com/a2gov-002-us/media/y2xlaek/rfp_18-20_proposalstab.pdf

S5: <https://a2gov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?GUID=9804D24A-99D7-4325-9E71-830F4911B31E&ID=4217322&Options=&Search=>

Analytical boundaries

- This is a historical portfolio case study, not a current solicitation and not legal or procurement advice.
- Part I factual claims and analyst judgments are limited to information available by the 2018 proposal deadline; later outcome evidence is intentionally excluded from that stage.
- Part II uses later public records only to document procurement outcome and test whether pre-award risk signals were realized, managed, or not observable in the source set.
- The case study does not invent evaluator scores, price rank, award rationale, revised final page counts, final whole-project cost, or final acceptance findings.
- The companion workbook preserves the same evidence firewall and contains formula-driven scope totals, official evaluation weights, compliance extraction, pre-award risk modeling, post-award validation, and the source register.

KeenVector capability demonstrated

Solicitation decomposition • compliance extraction • scope quantification • evaluation-weight analysis • addendum change tracking • risk modeling • outcome validation • source traceability

Evidence into direction.