

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 26000000106

Notice of Intent to Award Date: 12/12/2025

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 25000003094 No Wrong Door Time Study Administration and has recommended an award to HCBS Strategies Inc. in the amount of \$959,887.00, 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:

Adam Ashley, Solicitation Manager.

Ashleya2@michigan.gov

517-855-1376

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide No Wrong Door Time Study Administration. The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to two 1-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on September 15, 2025, for 16 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of October 1, 2025.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Sivic Solutions Group, LLC	10 Lanidex Plaza West Parsippany, NJ 07054	NO	NO
Public Consulting Group, LLC	148 State Street, 10th Floor Boston, MA 02109	NO	NO
HCBS Strategies Inc.	222 Ridgewood Rd. Baltimore, MD 21210	NO	NO

*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

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

	A3: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	40
2.	Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5	20
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10	10
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	30
	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 Solicitation Manager in collaboration with Joint Evolution Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Kristina Leonardi, Division Director DHHS – Health Services	Tammy Lemmer, State Assistant Administrator DHHS – Health Services
Katie Alexander, Section Manager DHHS – Health Services	Nathaniel Oliver, Contract Analyst DHHS – Bureau of Grants and Purchasing
Matthew McCool, Accounting Specialist DHHS - Cost Allocation Unit	
Adam Ashley, Buyer DTMB – CPS	

Evaluation Results

A. Sivic Solutions Group, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Sivic Solutions Group, LLC based on a score of 87, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 **37/40**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The Bidder did not provide sufficient experience and examples for Stratified Sampling.

2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **20/20**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **5/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The Bidder did not provide the requested sample reports.

Vendor Questions Worksheet **25/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The Bidder's experiences 1, 2, and 3 lack experience with the No Wrong Door program.

Total Score: 87/100

B. Public Consulting Group, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Public Consulting Group, LLC based on a score of 91, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

4. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 **34/40**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The Bidder's response indicated hesitation and lack of understanding of Michigan's No Wrong Door program.

5. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **17/20**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The Cost Pool sample report was not specific to No Wrong Door's needs.

6. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **10/10**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
7. Vendor Questions Worksheet **30/30**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 91/100

C. HCBS Strategies Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that HCBS Strategies Inc., based on a score of 97, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

8. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 **40/40**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
9. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **17/20**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
a. The phone number provided is a direct line instead of a customer service number.
10. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **10/10**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
11. Vendor Questions Worksheet **30/30**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score:97/100

III. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	Sivic Solutions Group, LLC	Public Consulting Group, LLC	HCBS Strategies Inc.
1	Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	37	34	40
2	Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5	20	17	17
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10	5	10	10
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet	25	30	30
	Total	87	91	97

IV. Pricing Summary

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

Sivic Solutions Group, LLC

Contract Year	Cost
December 2025 – December 2026	\$148,116.00
December 2026 – December 2027	\$148,116.00
December 2027 – December 2028	\$148,116.00
December 2028 – December 2029	\$148,116.00
December 2029 – December 2030	\$148,116.00
Total Cost	\$740,580.00

Public Consulting Group, LLC

Contract Year	Cost
December 15, 2025 – December 14, 2026	\$122,280.00
December 15, 2026 – December 14, 2027	\$147,360.00
December 15, 2027 – December 14, 2028	\$147,360.00
December 15, 2028 – December 14, 2029	\$147,360.00
December 15, 2029 – December 14, 2030	\$147,360.00
Total Cost	\$711,720.00

HCBS Strategies Inc.

Contract Year	Cost
---------------	------

December 2025 – December 2026	\$228,875.00
December 2026 – December 2027	\$172,146.00
December 2027 – December 2028	\$179,032.00
December 2028 – December 2029	\$186,193.00
December 2029 – December 2030	\$193,641.00
Total Cost	\$959,887.00

V. Negotiations

Second round pricing was requested from all bidders and the results are included in the Pricing Summary.

VI. 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.

HCBS Strategies Inc. provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include experience and understanding in providing No Wrong Door services and extensive experience utilizing Stratified Methodology.

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 HCBS Strategies Inc. in the amount of \$959,887.00.