

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000871**

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP #230000001420 – Statewide Grant Consulting Services and has recommended an award to Accenture LLP, Multiply Advisors, LLC dba Guardian Grant Advisors, Guidehouse Inc., Hagerty Consulting Inc., KPMG LLP, McKinsey & Company Inc., The Boston Consulting Group Inc., Tidal Basin Government Consulting LLC, WSP Michigan Inc. in the initial amount of \$0.00, 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:

Marissa Gove, Solicitation Manager  
 Govern1@michigan.gov  
 517-449-8952

**Background Information:**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Statewide Grant Consulting Services. The term of this contract is four (4) base years, with up to four (4) renewal options.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on April 17, 2023 for 21 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of May 8, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
<b>Accenture LLP</b>	1001 Woodward Ave, Suite 400 Detroit, MI 48226	No	Yes
<b>Broadsword Solutions Corporation</b>	24330 John R Rd, Suite 238 Hazel Park, MI 48030	No	Yes
<b>Deloitte &amp; Touche LLP</b>	30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, NY 10112	No	No
<b>Multiply Advisors, LLC dba Guardian Grant Advisors</b>	888 W. Big Beaver Rd, Suite 200 Troy, MI 48084	No	No
<b>Gud Marketing, Inc.</b>	1223 Turner St, Suite 101 Lansing, MI 48906	No	Yes
<b>Guidehouse Inc.</b>	1676 International Drive, Suite 800 McLean, VA 22102	No	No

<b>Hagerty Consulting, Inc.</b>	1618 Orrington Ave, Suite 201 Evanston, IL 60201	No	No
<b>Integrated Solutions Consulting, Corp</b>	220 S. Buchanan St. Edwardsville, IL 62025	No	No
<b>KPMG LLP</b>	1209 Orange St Wilmington, DE 19801	No	No
<b>Maner, Costerisan &amp; Ellis PC</b>	2425 E Grand River, Suite 1 Lansing, MI 48912	No	No
<b>McKinsey &amp; Company, Inc.</b>	1200 19th Street, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036	No	No
<b>The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.</b>	200 Pier 4 Boulevard Boston, MA 02210	No	No
<b>Tidal Basin Government Consulting, LLC</b>	126 Business Park Dr Utica, NY 13502	No	No
<b>WSP Michigan Inc.</b>	30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 4200 Chicago, IL 60602	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

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	45
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4	10
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5-10	10
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet - Experience	30
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience	5
	<b>Total</b>	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, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting
<b>Marissa Gove</b> Category Analyst DTMB
<b>Tiffany Belcher</b> Chief of Staff – Michigan Infrastructure Office DTMB
<b>Zach Kolodin</b> Chief Infrastructure Officer & Director – Michigan Infrastructure Office MIEOG

## III. Evaluation Results

### A. Accenture LLP

The Evaluation Team determined that Accenture LLP based on a score of 98, 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, Section 1 45/45

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

2. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
  
3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **9/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:
  - a. Section 9 Liquidated damages, the bidder had exceptions.
  
4. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **30/30**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
  
5. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience** **4/5**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Section 6 Standard Contract Terms, the bidder had exceptions.
  - b. Section 8 Michigan Economic Impact, the bidder did not disclose average pay.

**Total Score: 98/100**

**B. Broadsword Solutions Corporation**

The Evaluation Team determined that Broadsword Solutions Corporation based on a score of 74.5, did not 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, Section 1** **34.5/45**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Section A.1 Strategy Consulting, the bidder failed to describe in detail the method by which they would address the BIL needs.
  - b. Section A.2 MIO Technical Assistance Center, the bidder failed to describe how they would provide a cost-benefit analysis and did not detail how they would provide analytical and consultative support.
  - c. Section A.3 Supply Chain Resilience, the bidder did not provide details on how they would be able to support supply chain workgroups to ensure Michigan has supplies or how they would collaborate to increase production and develop strategies to deal with shortages.
  - d. Section A.4 Infrastructure Planning, the bidder provided limited details on how they would assist in developing infrastructure plans.
  - e. Section A.5 Infrastructure Project Permitting Coordination, the bidder did not provide details on their capacity to proactively prevent delays and

inefficiencies or support implementation of action plans to accelerate progress.

- f. Section B.1 Operations Consulting, the bidder lacked detail on how they would provide strategic, technical, and implementation support.
2. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
  3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
  4. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **15/30**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly unsatisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:
    - a. Experience 1 was not within size and only within limited scope of infrastructure.
    - b. Experience 2 was not within size or the scope of infrastructure and was only live for a short timeframe.
    - c. Experience 3 was not within size and only within limited scope of infrastructure.
  5. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience** **5/5**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 74.5/100**

**C. Deloitte & Touche LLP**

The Evaluation Team determined that Deloitte & Touche LLP 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.

1. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1** **45/45**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
2. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **8/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 9 Liquidated Damages, the bidder had exceptions.
- b. Section 10 Service-Level Agreement, the bidder had exceptions.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 30/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 4/5**

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

- a. Section 6 Standard Contract Terms, the bidder had exceptions.
- b. Section 7 Insurance Requirements, the bidder had exceptions.

**Total Score: 97/100**

**D. Multiply Advisors, LLC dba Guardian Grant Advisors**

The Evaluation Team determined that Multiply Advisors, LLC dba Guardian Grant Advisors based on a score of 88.5, 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, Section 1 36.5/45**

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

- a. Section A.1 Strategy Consulting, the bidder did not provide details on their ability to plan rapidly scale workforce needs.
- b. Section A.2 MIO Technical Assistance Center, the bidder did not provide details regarding the analytical and consultative support for technical assistance tribal, and other agencies.
- c. Section A.3 Supply Chain Resilience, the bidder did not address specifics around their approach to target predicted pinch points to mitigate project delays.
- d. Section A.5 Infrastructure Project Permitting Coordination, the bidder did not give details on how they would conduct diagnostics to understand potential delays.
- e. Section A.6 Supplier Diversity, the bidder did not provide details on how they expect to improve geographic diversity of contractor and supplier base in Michigan.

**2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 10/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10 8/10**

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

a. Section 5.1 Project Plan, the bidder did not provide a project plan.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 30/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 4/5**

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

- a. Section 6 Standard Contract Terms, the bidder had exceptions.
- b. Section 7 Insurance Requirements, the bidder had exceptions.

**Total Score: 88.5/100**

**E. Gud Marketing, Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that Gud Marketing, Inc. based on a score of 50.5, did not 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, Section 1 18/45**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly unsatisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted.

- a. Section A.1 Strategy Consulting, the bidder did not provide details on how they would plan to rapidly scale workforce to meet BIL needs and reduce risk of implementation delays.
- b. Section A.2 MIO Technical Assistance Center, the bidder stated that they do not conduct cost benefit analysis and did not provide details on how they would provide analytical and consultative support.
- c. Section A.3 Supply Chain Resilience, the bidder did not provide details on how they would be able to support supply chain workgroups to ensure Michigan has supplies or how they would collaborate to increase production and develop strategies to deal with shortages.
- d. Section A.4 Infrastructure Planning, the bidder did not provide any details on how they would assist in the development of statewide infrastructure plans.
- e. Section A.5 Infrastructure Project Permitting Coordination, the bidder did not demonstrate the ability to coordinate infrastructure project permitting to prevent delays and inefficiencies.
- f. Section A.6 Supplier Diversity, the bidder did not provide details on how they expect to improve geographic diversity of contractor and supplier base in Michigan.
- g. Section B.1 Operations Consulting, the bidder did not provide any details on how they would provide strategic, technical, and implementation support to pursue other funding opportunities for infrastructure.

- h. Section B.2 Outcomes Dashboard Execution, the bidder stated that they do not conduct dashboard execution.
  - i. Section C.1 Management Consulting, the bidder did not demonstrate the ability to onboard and train MIO team members to drive applications for competitive funding.
2. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
  3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **8.5/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
    - a. Section 5.1 Project Plan, the bidder’s project plan lacked detail.
  4. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **9/30**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly unsatisfactory, and the following deficiency was noted.
    - a. All experiences provided were out of scope of what is required in this RFP.
  5. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience** **5/5**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 50.5/100**

**F. Guidehouse Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that Guidehouse Inc. 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. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1** **45/45**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
2. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
4. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **30/30**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
5. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience** **5/5**



The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 100/100**

**G. Hagerty Consulting, Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that Hagerty Consulting, 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.

**1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 44/45**

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

- a. Section A.5 Infrastructure Project Permitting Coordination, the bidder did not provide details on how they would support implementation of action plans to accelerate progress.

**2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 8/10**

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

- a. Section 4.1 Contractor Representative, the bidder had exceptions.
- b. Section 4.6 Key Personnel, the bidder had exceptions.
- c. Section 4.9 Security, the bidder had exceptions.

**3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10 8/10**

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

- a. Section 9 Liquidated Damages, the bidder had exceptions.
- b. Section 10 Service-Level Agreement, the bidder had exceptions.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 30/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 5/5**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 95/100**

**H. Integrated Solutions Consulting, Corp**

The Evaluation Team determined that Integrated Solutions Consulting, Corp based on a score of 70, did not 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, Section 1** **26/45**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly unsatisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section A.1 Strategy Consulting, the bidder did not provide details on their ability to plan rapidly scale workforce needs.
- b. Section A.2 MIO Technical Assistance Center, the bidder failed to describe how they would provide a cost-benefit analysis and did not detail how they would provide analytical and consultative support.
- c. Section A.3 Supply Chain Resilience, the bidder did not provide details on how they would be able to support supply chain workgroups to ensure Michigan has supplies or how they would collaborate to increase production and develop strategies to deal with shortages.
- d. Section A.4 Infrastructure Planning, the bidder lacked some detail on how they would assist in the development of statewide infrastructure plans.
- e. Section A.5 Infrastructure Project Permitting Coordination, the bidder did not provide details on their capacity to proactively prevent delays and inefficiencies or support implementation of action plans to accelerate progress.
- f. Section A.6 Supplier Diversity, the bidder lacked detail on how they would improve the geographic diversity of contractor and supplier base in Michigan.
- g. Section B.1 Operations Consulting, the bidder failed to describe in detail how they would provide implementation support for the State to pursue other funding opportunities for infrastructure.
- h. Section B.2 Outcomes Dashboard Execution, the bidder lacked detail on how they would proactively communicate State outcomes via outcome dashboards.
- i. Section C.1 Management Consulting, the bidder lacked detail on how they would onboard and train MIO team members to drive applications for competitive funding.

**2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **9/10**

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

- a. Section 4.7 Organizational Chart, the bidder did not provide an organizational chart.

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

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **20/30**

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

- a. Experience 1 was not within size or within the scope of infrastructure and had a short timeframe.
- b. Experience 2 was not within size or within the scope of infrastructure.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 5/5**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 70/100**

**I. KPMG LLP**

The Evaluation Team determined that KPMG LLP 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.

**1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 45/45**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10 7/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 5.3 Reporting, the bidder did not provide an answer.
- b. Section 10 Service-Level Agreement, the bidder had exceptions.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 30/30**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 5/5**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 97/100**

**J. Maner, Costerisan & Ellis PC**

The Evaluation Team determined that Maner, Costerisan & Ellis PC based on a score of 55, did not 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, Section 1 18/45**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly unsatisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section A.1 Strategy Consulting, the bidder did not provide details on how they would plan to rapidly scale workforce to meet BIL needs and reduce risk of implementation delays.
- b. Section A.2 MIO Technical Assistance Center, the bidder did not provide details on how they would provide a cost-benefit analysis or analytical and consultative support.
- c. Section A.3 Supply Chain Resilience, the bidder did not provide details on how they would be able to support supply chain workgroups to ensure Michigan has supplies or how they would collaborate to increase production and develop strategies to deal with shortages.
- d. Section A.4 Infrastructure Planning, the bidder did not provide any details on how they would assist in the development of statewide infrastructure plans.
- e. Section A.5 Infrastructure Project Permitting Coordination, the bidder did not demonstrate the ability to coordinate infrastructure project permitting to prevent delays and inefficiencies.
- f. Section A.6 Supplier Diversity, the bidder did not provide details on how they expect to improve geographic diversity of contractor and supplier base in Michigan.
- g. Section B.1 Operations Consulting, the bidder did not provide any details on how they would provide strategic, technical, and implementation support to pursue other funding opportunities for infrastructure.
- h. Section B.2 Outcomes Dashboard Execution, the bidder did not provide any details on how they would proactively communicate State outcomes via outcome dashboards.
- i. Section C.1 Management Consulting, the bidder did not demonstrate the ability to onboard and train MIO team members to drive applications for competitive funding.

**2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 9/10**

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

- a. Section 4.1 Contractor Representative, the bidder did not provide an answer.

**3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10 8/10**

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

- a. Section 5.3 Reporting, the bidder did not provide an answer.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 15/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly unsatisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Experience 1 was not within size or within the scope of infrastructure and the timeframe was not provided.
- b. Experience 2 was not within size or within the scope of infrastructure and had a short timeframe.
- c. Experience 3 was not within size or within the scope of infrastructure.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 5/5**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 55/100**

**K. McKinsey & Company, Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that McKinsey & Company, Inc. based on a score of 99.5, 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, Section 1 45/45**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 10/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

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

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 30/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 4.5/5**

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

- a. Section 8 Michigan Economic Impact, the bidder did not disclose the average pay.

**Total Score: 99.5/100**

**L. The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that The Boston Consulting Group, Inc. 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. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1** **45/45**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
2. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
3. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
4. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **27/30**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Experiences 1 and 3 the bidder did not disclose the dollar value of their experience.
  - b. Experience 2 had a short timeframe and the bidder did not disclose the dollar value.
5. **Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience** **4/5**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Section 6 Standard Contract Terms, the bidder had exceptions.
  - b. Section 7 Insurance Requirements, the bidder had exceptions.

**Total Score: 96/100**

**M. Tidal Basin Government Consulting, LLC**

The Evaluation Team determined that Tidal Basin Government Consulting, LLC based on a score of 85.5, 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, Section 1** **36/45**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Section A.1 Strategy Consulting, the bidder failed to describe in detail the method by which they would address the BIL needs.

- b. Section A.2 MIO Technical Assistance Center, the bidder did not provide details regarding their plan to provide a cost-benefit analysis for BIL applications.
  - c. Section A.3 Supply Chain Resilience, the bidder lacked some detail in regards to their approach to target predicted pinch points to mitigate project delays.
  - d. Section A.4 Infrastructure Planning, the bidder provided limited details on how they will assist in developing infrastructure plans.
  - e. Section A.5 Infrastructure Project Permitting Coordination, the bidder lacked some detail on how they will proactively prevent delays and inefficiencies.
  - f. Section A.6 Supplier Diversity, the bidder provided limited details on how they will improve geographic diversity.
  - g. Section B.1 Operations Consulting, the bidder provided limited details on how they would provide technical assistance to obtain infrastructure funding.
  - h. Section B.2 Outcomes Dashboard Execution, the bidder provided limited details on how they would communicate State outcomes via outcome dashboards.
  - i. Section C.1 Management Consulting, the bidder provided limited details on how they would support MIO to ensure successful statewide infrastructure initiatives, asset meetings, and milestone tracking.
- 2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4** **10/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10** **9/10**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:
- a. Section 9 Liquidated Damages, the bidder had exceptions.
- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **26/30**  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Experience 1 was not within size or within the scope of infrastructure and had a short timeframe.
  - b. Experience 2 had a short timeframe.
  - c. Experience 3 had a short timeframe.
- 5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience** **4.5/5**

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

- a. Section 7 Insurance Requirements, the bidder had exceptions.

**Total Score: 85.5/100**

**N. WSP Michigan Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that WSP Michigan 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.

**1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 43/45**

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

- a. Section A.2 MIO Technical Assistance Center, the bidder failed to describe in detail how they would provide a cost-benefit analysis or analytical and consultative support.

**2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4 10/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10 9/10**

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

- a. Section 9 Liquidated Damages, the bidder had exceptions.

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 30/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 5/5**

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

**Total Score: 97/100**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

Bidder	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10	Vendor Questions Worksheet - Experience	Vendor Questions Worksheet - Excluding Experience	Total
Accenture LLP	45	10	9	30	4	98



<b>Broadsword Solutions Corporation</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>74.5</b>
<b>Deloitte &amp; Touche LLP</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Multiply Advisors, LLC dba Guardian Grant Advisors</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>88.5</b>
<b>Gud Marketing, Inc.</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>50.5</b>
<b>Guidehouse Inc.</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Hagerty Consulting, Inc.</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Integrated Solutions Consulting, Corp</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>KPMG LLP</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Maner, Costerisan &amp; Ellis PC</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>McKinsey &amp; Company, Inc.</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>99.5</b>
<b>The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Tidal Basin Government Consulting, LLC</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>85.5</b>
<b>WSP Michigan Inc.</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>97</b>

## V. Pricing Summary

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

<b>Accenture LLP</b>	
<b>Position</b>	<b>Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)</b>
SMA / Director / Program Manager	\$395.00
Senior Manager	\$340.00
Project Manager	\$310.00
Lead Consultant	\$290.00
Senior Staff	\$250.00
Staff	\$195.00
Clerical Support	\$150.00

<b>Deloitte &amp; Touche LLP</b>	
<b>Position</b>	<b>Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)</b>
Contractor Representative & Project Executive/Leader	\$400
Project Senior Manager	\$325
Project Manager	\$255
Project Senior Staff	\$215
Project Junior Staff	\$155
Project Specialist Leader	\$375
Project Specialist Manager	\$310
Project Specialist Senior Staff	\$250
Project Specialist Junior Staff	\$200
Project Associate	\$125

<b>Multiply Advisors, LLC dba Guardian Grant Advisors</b>		
<b>Position</b>	<b>Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)</b>	<b>Second Round Pricing</b>
Program Executive Director	\$325.00	\$295
Program Director	\$280.00	\$280
Project Manager	\$275.00	\$275
Strategy Consultant 5	\$245.00	\$240

Strategy Consultant 4	\$195.00	\$195
Strategy Consultant 3	\$165.00	\$155
Strategy Consultant 2	\$148.00	\$140
Strategy Consultant 1	\$117.00	\$115
Federal Policy and Compliance Senior Advisor	\$270.00	\$269
Federal Policy and Compliance Technical Specialist 4	\$244.00	\$240
Federal Policy and Compliance Technical Specialist 3	\$175.00	\$170
Federal Policy and Compliance Technical Specialist 2	\$146.00	\$140
Admin Staff	\$94.00	\$92
Staff Accountants	\$145.00	\$145
Senior Accountants	\$183.00	\$181
Manager Accountant	\$215.00	\$212
Project Controls Specialist 3	\$175.00	\$170
Project Controls Specialist 2	\$170.00	\$165
Project Controls Specialist 1	\$137.00	\$135
Safety Manager	\$220.00	\$210
Management Consultant 5	\$225.00	\$220
Management Consultant 4	\$180.00	\$175
Management Consultant 3	\$150.00	\$145
Management Consultant 2	\$135.00	\$130
Management Consultant 1	\$110.00	\$100
Subject Matter Expert	\$275.00	\$265
IT Specialist	\$175.00	\$170
Change Management Consultant	\$155.00	\$150
Instructional Designer	\$145.00	\$140
Trainer 2	\$145.00	\$140
Trainer 1	\$120.00	\$115

<b>Guidehouse Inc.</b>	
<b>Position</b>	<b>Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)</b>
Engagement and Additional Partners	\$395
Engagement Director / Director	\$315
Workforce SME	\$305
Data Analytics and Visualization SME	\$305
Infrastructure and Capital Projects SME	\$305
IIJA/IRA Federal Programs SME	\$305
Supplier Diversity SME	\$267
Water and Waste SME	\$267
Supply Chain Management SME	\$267
Grid Resilience SME	\$267
High Speed Internet SME	\$267
Engagement Manager / Senior Manager	\$267
Senior Manager	\$267
Manager	\$238
Senior Consultant	\$200
Consultant	\$170
Analyst	\$105

<b>Hagerty Consulting, Inc.</b>	
<b>Position</b>	<b>Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)</b>
Project Executive	\$225
Grant Strategy Advisor	\$215
Senior Programmatic Expert	\$230
Programmatic Expert	\$205
Project Lead	\$185
Deputy Project Lead	\$175
Grant Research and Opportunity Identification Lead	\$185
Grant Writing Lead	\$185
Grant Researcher	\$160

Junior Grant Researcher	\$145
Senior Grant Writer	\$175
Grant Writer	\$160
Junior Grant Writer	\$145

KPMG LLP		
Position	Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)	Second Round Pricing
Partner / Principal / Managing Director	\$570	\$559
Director / Senior Manager	\$500	\$490
Manager	\$470	\$461
Senior Associate	\$400	\$392
Associate	\$370	\$363
Paraprofessional	\$200	\$196
KGS	\$200	\$196
<b>Option 2</b>		
All Positions (e.g., Project Manager, Consultant, Senior Consultant, Associate/Analyst and Para-Professional/Support)	\$450	\$441

McKinsey & Company, Inc.	
Position	Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)
Leadership - Executive/ Strategy	\$1,167
Engagement Manager - Executive/ Strategy	\$940
Associate- Executive/ Strategy	\$566
Business Analyst - Executive/ Strategy	\$390
Associate - Data Science	\$566
Business Analyst - Data Science	\$390
Associate - UX/HCD	\$566

Business Analyst - UX/HCD	\$390
Associate - Implementation	\$566
Business Analyst - Implementation	\$390
Media Designer	\$201
Graphics Project Manager	\$189
Business Presentation Designer	\$178
Capabilities and Insights Expert	\$402
Capabilities and Insights Analyst	\$303
Engagement Team Assistant	\$133

The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.					
Position	Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)				
	1OCT22 - 30SEP23	1OCT23 - 30SEP24	1OCT24 - 30SEP25	1OCT25 - 30SEP26	1OCT26 - 30SEP27
Executive Strategy Senior Partner	\$1,097.37	\$1,171.98	\$1,251.67	\$1,336.79	\$1,427.69
Executive Strategy Director	\$1,033.17	\$1,103.42	\$1,178.46	\$1,258.59	\$1,344.18
Executive Strategy Project Leader	\$699.36	\$746.92	\$797.71	\$851.95	\$909.88
Executive Strategy Senior Consultant	\$618.74	\$660.82	\$705.75	\$753.73	\$804.99
Executive Strategy Consultant	\$471.82	\$503.91	\$538.17	\$574.77	\$613.85
Executive Strategy Senior Associate	\$397.37	\$424.39	\$453.25	\$484.07	\$516.99
Lead Knowledge Analyst	\$316.18	\$337.67	\$360.63	\$385.15	\$411.34
Knowledge Analyst	\$175.81	\$187.76	\$200.53	\$214.17	\$228.73
Senior Experience Designer	\$318.65	\$340.32	\$363.46	\$388.16	\$414.56
Senior Engineer	\$201.52	\$215.22	\$229.85	\$245.47	\$262.16

Principal Data Scientist	\$305.74	\$326.53	\$348.74	\$372.46	\$397.78
Lead Data Scientist	\$198.73	\$212.25	\$226.67	\$242.09	\$258.55
Data Scientist	\$127.17	\$135.81	\$145.05	\$154.91	\$165.44
Visual Design Expert	\$107.71	\$115.03	\$122.85	\$131.21	\$140.13
Functional Expert and Researcher	\$132.03	\$141.02	\$150.60	\$160.84	\$171.78
Case Team Support Admin	\$57.21	\$61.11	\$65.27	\$69.70	\$74.44

<b>Tidal Basin Government Consulting, LLC</b>		
<b>Position</b>	<b>Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)</b>	<b>Second Round Pricing</b>
Principal	\$289.70	-
Program Manager	\$263.60	\$252.25
Deputy Program Manager	\$190.50	\$182.80
Program Coordinator	\$88.20	\$83.79
Project Manager	\$147.90	\$141.97
Project Specialist	\$117.70	\$113.28
Project Coordinator	\$105.10	\$101.31
Administrative/Clerical	\$66.70	\$63.55
Consultant I	\$93.70	\$89.29
Consultant II	\$106.30	\$101.26
Consultant III	\$131.50	\$125.20
Technical Lead	\$204.90	-
Technical Analyst I	\$152.00	-
Technical Analyst II	\$174.60	-
Technical Analyst III	\$187.20	-
Program Lead	\$213.20	\$204.37
Program Analyst I	\$130.30	\$125.25
Program Analyst II	\$149.20	\$143.20
Subject Matter Expert (Technical)	\$268.20	-
Subject Matter Expert (Programmatic)	\$230.40	-

Legal Counsel	\$302.30	-
---------------	----------	---

<b>WSP Michigan Inc.</b>		
<b>Position</b>	<b>Hourly Rate (Not to Exceed)</b>	
WSP		
Assistant Consultant	\$121.58	\$118.11
Associate Consultant	\$136.64	\$132.74
Consultant	\$154.13	\$149.72
Senior Consultant	\$185.32	\$180.03
Lead Consultant	\$205.50	\$199.63
Assistant Vice President	\$263.17	\$255.65
Vice President	\$274.70	\$266.85
Senior Vice President I	\$359.26	\$349.00
Senior Vice President II	\$522.53	\$507.60
EBP-US		
Senior Officer	\$306.89	-
Officer	\$236.23	-
Principal	\$220.26	-
Analyst 5	\$236.23	-
Analyst 4	\$168.07	-
Analyst 3	\$146.51	-
Analyst 2	\$131.71	-
Analyst 1	\$114.38	-
IT Programmer	\$306.89	-
Public Sector Consultants		
Vice President	\$315	-
Director	\$260	-
Senior Consultant	\$200	-
Senior Project Manager	\$205	-
Senior Data Scientist	\$210	-
Consultant	\$130	-



Data Scientist	\$180	-
----------------	-------	---

**VI. Negotiations**

Five bidders took exceptions within their proposals, the State contacted those bidders during clarifications to request the removal of those exceptions. Four of those five bidders agreed to remove their exceptions. In addition, four bidders offered price reductions in the second round.

**VII. Award Recommendation**

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidders 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, agreement to original contract terms and SOW requirements, providing adequate experiences, and price. The pre-qualification is awarded to the following Bidders with an initial contract amount of \$0.00 each with monies to be added through Tier 2 SOW needs:

1. Accenture LLP
2. Multiply Advisors, LLC dba Guardian Grant Advisors
3. Guidehouse Inc.
4. Hagerty Consulting, Inc.
5. KPMG LLP
6. McKinsey & Company, Inc.
7. The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.
8. Tidal Basin Government Consulting, LLC
9. WSP Michigan Inc.