

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000556

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 240000000590 SW Cost Allocation and has recommended an award to Maximus in the amount of \$1,384,500.00, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Emily Massa, Solicitation Manager.

Massae@michigan.gov

517-897-7321

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Statewide cost allocation reporting services, more specifically the Statewide Cost Allocation Plan (SWCAP) with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The term of this contract is three years, with up to five renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on January 12th, 2024. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of February 9th, 2024.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Maximus US Services, Inc.	1600 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1400 McLean, VA 22102	No	Yes
Public Consulting Group	148 State Street, 10 th Floor Boston, MA 02109	No	Yes

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3	50
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4-9	25
3.	Vendor Questions Worksheet, Background and Experience	25
	Total	100

Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by a Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC), which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Emily Massa, Solicitation Manager DTMB/CPS	Maria Tyszkiewicz, Budget Director & Manager of Budget & Forecasting Unit DTMB/Financial Services Division
Shawna Hessling, Director of Accounting & Financial Reporting SBO/OFM	
Derek Childs, Statewide Single Audit Coordinator SBO/OFM	

III. Evaluation Results

A. Maximus US Services, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Maximus US Services, Inc. based on a score of 95, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted (45/50):

- a. Section 1.1.I & J: Bidder did not provide answers in the response boxes. The Bidder referenced separate document and did not specify where the answers were located.
- 2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-9: The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (25/25)
- 3. Vendor Questions Worksheet, Background and Experience, The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (25/25)

Total Score:95/100

B. Public Consulting Group

The Evaluation Team determined that Public Consulting Group based on a score of 86, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted (41/50):
 - a. Section 1.1.D,E, & F: Bidder’s reporting system would require additional IT security requirements and more assistance from OFM than anticipated.
 - b. Section 1.1.K & L: Bidder’s response does not align with requirement of RFP stating OFM assistance should be minimal.
 - c. Section 3.9: Bidder described their own security measures at their facilities, instead of at the State facilities per the requirement.
- 2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-9: The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted (20/25):
 - a. Section 4.3: Report provided is not a SWCAP report.
- 3. Vendor Questions Worksheet, Background and Experience: The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (25/25)

Total Score:86/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria		Maximus US Services, Inc.	Public Consulting Group LLC
1	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3	45	41
2	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4-9	25	20
3	Vendor Questions Worksheet, Background and Experience	25	25
	Total	95	86

V. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

Deliverable		Maximus US Services, Inc.	Public Consulting Group LLC
1	Fixed price for SWCAP (price shown is for all three contract years)	\$97,500.00 *Price is for all three years	Year 1: \$40,500 Year 2: \$22,500 Year 3: \$22,500 Total for contract: \$85,500
2	Hourly rate for any additional services	\$130/hour (years 1-3) \$135/hour (years 4-8 - in the event option years are utilized)	\$135/hour

VI. Negotiations

Second round pricing was requested and received from both bidders.

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Maximus US Services, Inc. provided the best value to the State. Best value factor for Award Recommendation includes extensive experience with multiple states SWCAP reporting needs.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award.

Award Recommendation is made to Maximus US Services, Inc. in the amount of \$1,384,500.00.