

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number: 260000000307**

**Notice of Intent to Award Date: 3/19/2026**

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of **RFP 260000000800 - MIND M&O** and has recommended an award to Tech Rudder LLC in the amount of \$2,635,632.00, 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:

**David Stohrer**, Solicitation Manager.

stohrer1@michigan.gov

(517) 898-4043

**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 the State with a team of IT professionals for maintenance and support of the (State on-premise hosted) MIND 2.0 system. The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to 5 one-year renewal options.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on January 15,2026 for 21 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of February 5, 2026:

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
<b>22<sup>nd</sup> Century Technologies, Inc.</b>	8251 Greensboro Drive, Suite 900, McLean, VA 22102	N/A	N/A
<b>Tech Rudder LLC</b>	2057 Birch Bluff Drive, Okemos, MI 48864	N/A	N/A

\*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 Criteria Name	Weight
<b>Vendor Question Worksheet – Experiences Only</b>	30
<b>Resume Templates</b>	15
<b>Schedule A - Statement of Work</b>	25
<b>Schedule D – Service Level Agreements</b>	5
<b>Schedule E – Data Security Requirements</b>	5
<b>Schedule F - Transition In / Out Plan</b>	10
<b>Clarity of Proposal</b>	10

Proposals receiving 80 or more evaluation points had pricing evaluated and were considered for award.

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

## II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting	
<b>David Stohrer</b> DTMB – Central Procurement	<b>Bryan Van Dorn</b> Michigan Department of Education
<b>Tami Navarre</b> Michigan Department of Education	<b>Sean Strom</b> DTMB – Agency Services
Advisory	
<b>Deanne Kelleher</b> Michigan Department of Education	<b>David Quesada</b> DTMB – Agency Services
<b>Drew Finkbeiner</b> Michigan Department of Education	

### III. Evaluation Results

#### A. 22<sup>nd</sup> Century Technologies, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that 22<sup>nd</sup> Century Technologies, based on a score of 68.65, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

##### 1. Vendor Question Worksheet

The following deficiencies were noted for this section:

- a. **Experience 1**, pgs. 16-17: The scope and dollar amount of the experience provided were not in line with our expectations. The experience listed did not have the level of detail that the State required to validate their prior experience.
- b. **Experience 2**, pgs. 17-18: The scope and dollar amount of the experience provided were not in line with our expectations
- c. **Experience 3**, pgs. 18-19: The scope and dollar amount of the experience provided were not in line with our expectations. The experience listed did not have the level of detail that the State required to validate their prior experience.

##### 2. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates

The following deficiencies were noted for this section:

- a. **Project Manager Resume Template**, pgs. 33-38: The experience listed is not in-line with what the State is expecting. Requested certifications were not provided.
- b. **Security Officer Resume Template**, pgs. 39-44: The indicated percentage of time this resource is allocated to the project is too high for a security officer.
- c. **Lead Developer Resume Template**, pg. 46: The experience listed is not in-line with what the State is expecting. Bidder's response does not demonstrate the experience that the State considers necessary for this position.

##### 3. Schedule A – Statement of Work

The following deficiencies were noted for this section:

- a. **Section 3 – Purpose**, pgs. 88-89: Bidder did not provide adequate details about how they can scale-up to take on additional medium-level enhancement work.
- b. **Section 3 – Purpose**, pgs. 90-91: Bidder did not provide adequate details about how they can scale-up to take on additional large-level enhancement work.

- c. **Section 6 – User Type & Capacity**, pgs. 96-97: Bidder’s response did not provide sufficient detail how they will support the minimum number of concurrent users of the MIND system.
  - d. **Section 6 – User Type & Capacity**, pgs. 98-99: Bidder’s response does not provide sufficient details in how they plan to maintain the latency response time.
  - e. **Section 9 – End User & IT Environment**, pgs. 104-106: Bidder does not provide adequate detail on what access requirements are necessary.
  - f. **Section 11 – Integration**, pgs. 113-115: Bidder’s response does not indicate thorough understanding of the systems integrations.
  - g. **Section 14 – Training Services**, pgs. 116-117: Bidder did not provide adequate details about their training plan. Bidder did not provide examples, as required.
  - h. **Section 16 – Documentation**, pg. 123: Bidder did not provide examples, as required.
  - i. **Section 24 – Project Management**, pgs. 138-140: Bidder did not clarify if they will be using SUITE, or if they are proposing their own substitution.
4. Clarity of Proposal  
The following deficiencies were noted in the bid:
- a. Bidder did not remove **Schedule B – Pricing** from their bid and offer as a separate attachment, as instructed.
  - b. Bidder did not submit their bid in Microsoft Word format, as instructed.
  - c. Resumes provided for **Attachment 1 – Resume Templates** were not limited in page number, as instructed.
  - d. Many Bidder responses were exceedingly lengthy, while not actually answering the question asked or providing the details that were requested.

**Total Score: 68.65/100**

---

## **B. Tech Rudder LLC**

The Evaluation Team determined that Tech Rudder LLC, based on a score of 82.84, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

### **1. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates**

The following deficiencies were noted for this section:

- a. **Contract Administrator Resume Template**, pg. 26: Vendor did not provide the requested information.
  - b. **Business Analyst Resume Template**, pg. 27: Vendor did not provide the requested information.
  - c. **Tester Resume Template**, pg. 28: Vendor did not provide the requested information.
2. Schedule A – Statement of Work  
 The following deficiencies were noted for this section:
- a. **Section 14 – Training Services**, pgs. 110-111: Bidder did not provide examples, as required.
  - b. **Section 16 – Documentation**, pgs. 113-114: Bidder did not provide examples, as required.
  - e. **Section 24.1 – Testing Services & Acceptance**, pgs. 137-139: Bidder’s response did not provide the frequency/cadence of the processes, as requested. Bidder did not confirm agreement with the second and third part of the question.
3. Clarity of Proposal  
 The following deficiencies were noted in the bid:
- a. Bidder did not remove **Schedule B – Pricing** from their bid and offer as a separate attachment, as instructed.
  - b. **Vendor Question Worksheet**, pg. 18: Bidder provided contact information for a different individual than was listed as the reference for the experience.
  - c. **Vendor Question Worksheet**, pg. 22: Bidder listed a higher minimum paid annual wage than average annual wage.

**Total Score: 82.84/100**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

	Selection Criteria	22 <sup>nd</sup> Century	Tech Rudder
1	Vendor Question Worksheet – Experiences Only	20	25
2	Resume Templates	8.75	7.5
3	Schedule A - Statement of Work	16.9	22.84
4	Schedule D – Service Level Agreements	5	5
5	Schedule E – Data Security Requirements	5	5
6	Schedule F - Transition In / Out Plan	10	10

<b>7</b>	<b>Clarity of Proposal</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7.5</b>
<b>Total:</b>		<b>68.65</b>	<b>82.84</b>

**V. Pricing Summary**

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

	<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Tech Rudder LLC</b>
<b>1</b>	Maintenance & Support – Base Year 1	\$ 576,000.00
<b>2</b>	Maintenance & Support – Base Year 2	\$ 576,000.00
<b>3</b>	Maintenance & Support – Base Year 3	\$ 480,000.00
<b>4</b>	Maintenance & Support – Base Year 4	\$ 494,400.00
<b>5</b>	Maintenance & Support – Base Year 5	\$ 509,232.00
<b>Total Price</b>		<b>\$ 2,635,632.00</b>

**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.

Tech Rudder LLC provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

- Bidder’s experiences indicate they have extensive familiarity in working with USDA, working with grants, and other specific federal processes that would be part of this contract.
- Tech Rudder developed both MIND and the mobile application, and has extensive familiarity with both systems including knowledge of the capabilities.
- Bidder’s roadmap for the future of these applications (as described in Section 17 – Additional Products & Services on page 114 of their bid) is in alignment with USDA, ONS, MDE, and DTMB.
- Tech Rudder agreed to the Terms and Conditions as presented.

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 Tech Rudder LLC in the amount of \$2,635,632.00.