

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 260000000242

Notice of Intent to Award Date: 2/27/2026

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 260000000042 Financial & Strategic Consulting and Advisory Services and has recommended an award to Guidehouse in the amount of \$13,000,000.00, 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

Public copies of all bidder proposals can be found here: [DTMB - Bid Proposals \(michigan.gov\)](#)

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Financial & Strategic Consulting and Advisory Services. The term of this contract is 3 years, with up to 5 renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on November 7, 2026, for 19 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of November 26, 2026.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Baker Tilly Advisory Group	205 N Michigan Ave, 28th Fl Chicago, IL 60601-5927	NO	NO
Crowe	225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2600 Chicago, Illinois 60606	NO	NO
Guidehouse	1676 International Drive, Suite 800 McLean, VA 22102	NO	NO
KPMG	Two Manhattan West, 375 9th Ave New York, NY 10001	NO	NO
Plante Moran Realpoint	3000 Town Center, Suite 100 Southfield, MI 48075	NO	NO
Watson & Yates	2937 E Grand Blvd, Suite 502 Detroit, MI 48202	NO	YES
Bean Consulting & CO	586 Territorial Road Benton Harbor MI, 49022	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

Step 1: The following chart represents factors that will be utilized to score Step 1. A limited number of Bidders who receive a minimum score of **80** will be further evaluated based on the criteria identified in Step 2. Bidders who do not meet the minimum point threshold in Step 1 will not be considered for award.

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	35
2.	Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5	10
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10	15
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet (Excluding Vendor Experience)	10
5.	Vendor Experience	30
	Total	100

Step 2: A limited number of Bidders who pass Step 1 will be required to make an oral presentation to the State as follows: The top 5 Bidders with the highest-ranking scores who pass Step 1 will be contacted after the initial JEC meetings to establish a date and time for the oral presentation. In the case of a tie or if the State deems otherwise necessary, the number of bidders could change. Oral presentations will be held virtually via MS Teams. The following chart represents factors that will be utilized to score Step 2. The State will select the Bidder with the highest combined score by summing the Bidder’s scores from Steps 1 and 2.

	Oral Presentation Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Company Background	20
2.	Case Study Response	40
3.	Vendor Experience	40
	Total	100

Oral presentations will be no longer than **25** minutes. They will include a brief narrative on company background, response to a case study provided by the State, and further explanation of one of the

two non-State of Michigan experiences provided in the Vendor Questions Worksheet. The State is not interested in marketing materials.

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

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by the Solicitation Manager in collaboration with Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Adam Ashley, Solicitation Manager Central Procurement Services - DTMB	
James Ranger, Innovating Contracting Manager Office of Major Projects - MDOT	
Jennifer Frank, Buyer Specialist Purchasing and Budget - LEO	

III. Evaluation Results

Step 1: Technical Evaluation

A. Baker Tilly Advisory Group

The Evaluation Team determined that Baker Tilly Advisory Group, based on a score of 96, 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 **35/35**

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

- 2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **6/10**

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

- a. Resumes were not included in the bidder’s proposal.

- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **15/15**

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

- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet **10/10**

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

- 5. Vendor Experience **30/30**

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

Total Score: 96/100

B. Crowe

The Evaluation Team determined that Crowe, based on a score of 85, 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 **35/35**

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

- 2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **10/10**

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

- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **15/15**

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

- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet **10/10**

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

- 5. Vendor Experience **15/30**

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

- a. The referenced projects are not comparable in size of the projects that are expected for this Contract.

Total Score: 85/100

C. Guidehouse

The Evaluation Team determined that Guidehouse, based on a score of 100, 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 **35/35**

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

- 2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **10/10**

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

- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **15/15**

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

- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet **10/10**

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

- 5. Vendor Experience **30/30**

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

Total Score:100/100

D. KPMG

The Evaluation Team determined that KPMG, based on a score of 100, 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 **35/35**

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

- 2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **10/10**

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

- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **15/15**

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

- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet **10/10**

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

- 5. Vendor Experience **30/30**

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

Total Score:100/100

E. Plante Moran Realpoint

The Evaluation Team determined that Plante Moran Realpoint, based on a score of 97.5, 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 **35/35**

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

- 2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **7.5/10**

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

- a. The resumes were structured as bios and lacked detail on project experience.

- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **15/15**

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

- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet **10/10**

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

- 5. Vendor Experience **30/30**

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

Total Score: 97.5/100

F. Watson & Yates

The Evaluation Team determined that Watson & Yates, based on a score of 73, 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 **35/35**

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

- 2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **7/10**

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

- a. The listed key personnel lack the expertise that the State is seeking.

- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **15/15**

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

- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet **6/10**

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

- a. The company is newer and lacks the capacity and experience required for a contract of this size.

- 5. Vendor Experience **10/30**

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

- a. The company has less than 5 years of experience. Additionally, the referenced projects size and duration are not comparable to what is expected by the State for this Contract.

Total Score: 73/100

G. Bean Consulting & CO

The Evaluation Team determined that Bean Consulting & CO, based on a score of 73, 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 **35/35**

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

- 2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5 **7/10**

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

- a. The listed key personnel lack the expertise that the State is seeking.
- b. The Project Director listed in the proposal is from the subcontractor.

- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10 **15/15**

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

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet 6/10

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

- a. The company is newer and lacks the capacity and experience required for a contract of this size.

5. Vendor Experience 10/30

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

- a. The company has less than 5 years of experience. Additionally, the experience provided lacks sufficient detail such as the project's relevance to scope of this Contract.

Total Score: 73/100

Step 2: Oral Presentations

A. Baker Tilly Advisory Group

The Evaluation Team determined that Baker Tilly Advisory Group, based on a score of 95, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentations Evaluation Criteria.

1. Company Background 20/20

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

2. Case Study Response 40/40

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

3. Vendor Experience 35/40

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

- a. The reference experience demonstrates relevant infrastructure experience; however, it does not fully reflect the broader infrastructure expertise desired by the State.

Total Score: 95/100

B. Guidehouse

The Evaluation Team determined that Guidehouse, based on a score of 100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentations Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Company Background **20/20**

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

- 2. Case Study Response **40/40**

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

- 3. Vendor Experience **40/40**

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

Total Score:100/100

C. KPMG

The Evaluation Team determined that KPMG, based on a score of 100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentations Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Company Background **20/20**

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

- 2. Case Study Response **40/40**

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

- 3. Vendor Experience **40/40**

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

Total Score:100/100

D. Plante Moran Realpoint

The Evaluation Team determined that Plante Moran Realpoint, based on a score of 92, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentations Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Company Background **20/20**

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

- 2. Case Study Response **37/40**

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

- a. The referenced project was not comparable in scale to what is expected by the State.

- 3. Vendor Experience **35/40**

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

- a. The reference experience demonstrates relevant infrastructure experience; however, it does not fully reflect the broader infrastructure expertise desired by the State

Total Score: 92/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	Baker Tilly Advisory Group	Crowe	Guidehouse	KPMG	Plante Moran Realpoint	Watson & Yates	Bean Consulting & CO
1	Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	35	35	35	35	35	35	35
2	Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-5	7	10	10	10	7.5	7	7
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6-10	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet	9	10	10	10	10	6	6
5	Vendor Experience	30	15	30	30	30	10	10
	Total	96	85	100	100	97.5	73	73

V. Oral Presentations/Demonstrations

	Selection Criteria	Baker Tilly Advisory Group	Guidehouse	KPMG	Plante Moran Realpoint
1	Company Background	20	20	20	20
2	Case Study Response	40	40	40	37
3	Vendor Experience	35	40	40	35

	Total	95	100	100	92
--	--------------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------

VI. Pricing Summary

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

1. Baker Tilly Advisory Group

Staff/Role (Baker Tilly equivalent)	Not to Exceed Hourly Rate
Project Manager (Equivalent to Partner/Principal)	\$425
Senior Consultant (Equivalent to Director)	\$375
Consultant (Equivalent to Manager)	\$350
Associate/Analyst (Equivalent to Consultant)	\$250
Para-Professional/Support	\$175

2. Crowe

Staff/Role	Not to Exceed Hourly Rate
Partner/Principal	\$400
Senior Manager/Subject Matter Expert	\$325
Project Manager	\$300
Consultant	\$250
Senior Consultant	\$200
Associate/Analyst	\$175
Para-Professional/Support	\$125

3. Guidehouse

Staff/Role	Not to Exceed Hourly Rate
Partner*	\$370
Director*	\$295
Associate Director / Senior Manager*	\$281
Manager / Project Manager	\$210
Senior Consultant	\$198
Consultant	\$146
Associate/Analyst	\$105
Para-Professional/Support	\$80

4. KPMG

Staff/Role	Not to Exceed Hourly Rate
KPMG Principal/Partner	\$520
KPMG Managing Director	\$520
KPMG Director	\$525
KPMG Manager	\$475
KPMG Senior Associate	\$395
KPMG Associate	\$350
KPMG Para-Professional	\$150
Subcontractor – Steudle	\$325
Subcontractor – Pont	\$435

Subcontractor – TIS	\$400
KPMG Global Services Support*	\$300

5. Plante Moran Realpoint

Staff/Role		Not to Exceed Hourly Rate
Greg VanKirk - Partner in Charge	Partner	\$385-\$420
Andy Fountain - Program Manager	Principal	\$330-\$385
Sean Grisan – Program Administrator	Vice President	\$255-\$320
Jake Austermann – Incentives Analysis	Principal	\$330-\$385
Doug Smith – Development Feasibility Analysis & Implementation	Principal	\$330-\$385
Kristin Mixon - Development Feasibility Analysis & Implementation	Senior Vice President	\$310-\$350
Todd Fenton - P3 Implementation	Vice President	\$255-\$320
Bryan Amann - P3 Implementation & Feasibility Analysis	Senior Vice President	\$310-\$350
Alicia Washeleski - Construction Implementation	Principal	\$330-\$385
Joe Graf - Infrastructure Analysis	Senior Vice President	\$310-\$350
Jeff Calliguiri - Infrastructure Analysis	Senior Vice President	\$310-\$350

Scott Patton – Management Consulting	Partner	\$385-\$420
--------------------------------------	---------	-------------

6. Watson & Yates

Staff/Role	Not to Exceed Hourly Rate
Partner	\$370
Director	\$343
Managing Consultant	\$260
Consultant	\$233
Blended Rate	\$276

7. Bean Consulting & CO

Staff/Role	Not to Exceed Hourly Rate
Project Director	\$750
Project Manager	\$625
Consultant	\$375
Senior Consultant	\$550
Associate/Analyst	\$200
Para-Professional/Support	\$175
Strategic Advisor	\$700

VII. Negotiations

The awarded vendor provided second-round pricing that is reflected in the Pricing Summary above.

VIII. 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.

Guidehouse provided the best value to the state. Best value factors for the award recommendation include pricing and experience with the scope of work.

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 Guidehouse in the amount of \$13,000,000.00.