

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 260000000487

Notice of Intent to Award Date: 5/15/2026

The Michigan Department of Education has completed the evaluation of RFP 260000001772 Web Development Services for Library of Michigan and has recommended an award to Dewpoint LLC in the amount of \$126,780.00, 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:

Jenny Manar, Solicitation Manager.

manarj@michigan.gov

517-241-2170

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide web development services for the Library of Michigan. The term of this contract is 1 year with 1 option year.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on April 13, 2026, for 14 calendar days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of April 27, 2026.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Dewpoint LLC	300 South Washington Square, Suite 200, Lansing, MI 48933	N/A	Yes
Exemplifi LLC	2563 Waverley Street, Palo Alto, CA 94301	N/A	N/A
Lyra Interactive, LLC	3313 Brookstone Pass Dr, Yukon, OK 73099	N/A	N/A
People Tech Group, Inc	18300 NE Union Hill Road, Suite 210, Redmond, WA 98052	N/A	N/A
Cynerge Consulting, Inc.	31 N Saginaw St, Pontiac, MI 48342	N/A	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: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

- Must have comprehensive web development and customization experience.
- Must demonstrate ability to work in multiple platforms.
- Must demonstrate ability to develop and maintain cross platform integration.
- Must have expertise in multiple programming languages.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Scope and Section 1	40
2.	Service Requirements, Acceptance, Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4	20
3.	Project Management, Pricing, Ordering, Invoice and Payment, Liquidated Damages, ADA Compliance – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5-10	20
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	20
	Total	100

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

II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting	Voting
Louise Loftus Financial Specialist MDE/Library of Michigan	Shauna Quick Library Technology Access Consultant MDE/Library of Michigan
Biz Gallo Interim Library Development Manager MDE/Library of Michigan	Carol Munroe Departmental Analyst MDE/Office of Financial Management
Jenny Manar Buyer MDE/Office of Financial Management	

III. Evaluation Results

A. Dewpoint LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Dewpoint LLC 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. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Scope and Section 1. 40/40
The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.
2. Service Requirements, Acceptance, Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4. 20/20
The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.
3. Project Management, Pricing, Ordering, Invoice and Payment, Liquidated Damages, ADA Compliance – Schedule A Statement of Work, Sections 5-10. 18/20
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Project plan lacked detail, more specifics needed.
4. Vendor Questions Worksheet. 19/20
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Did not provide address of parent company.

Total Score: 97/100

B. Exemplifi LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Exemplifi LLC based on a score of 94, 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, Scope and Section 1. 38/40
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Ongoing maintenance, security updates, and performance monitoring does not correlate with items discussed in detailed work plan.
2. Service Requirements, Acceptance, Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4. 17/20
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Detailed chronological resumes were not provided.

3. Project Management, Pricing, Ordering, Invoice and Payment, Liquidated Damages, ADA Compliance – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10. 20/20

The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet. 19/20

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

- a. Listed State of Michigan experience but did not provide examples.

Total Score: 94/100

C. Lyra Interactive, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Lyra Interactive LLC based on a score of 22, did not 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, Scope and Section 1. 10/40

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. RFP structure was not followed.
- b. Questions and checkbox acknowledgements were not answered.
- c. Project specific details were missing.

2. Service Requirements, Acceptance, Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4. 5/20

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Key Personnel were not listed for this project.
- b. Organization Chart was not provided.
- c. Resumes were not provided.

3. Project Management, Pricing, Ordering, Invoice and Payment, Liquidated Damages, ADA Compliance – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10. 7/20

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

- a. Lacking detail, more specifics needed.
- b. Project Management tool/framework was not specified.
- c. No clear reporting metric/cadence suggested.
- d. No explanation on how bidder would comply with ADA/WCAG 2.1AA.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet. 0/20

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. No vendor questions worksheet provided.

Total Score: 22/100

D. People Tech Group, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that People Tech Group, Inc. based on a score of 73, did not 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, Scope and Section 1. 25/40

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

- a. Cover letter addresses working with Ferris State University and not Library of Michigan.
- b. Project specific details were missing, more specifics needed.

2. Service Requirements, Acceptance, Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4. 17/20

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

- a. Key Personnel were not listed for this project.

3. Project Management, Pricing, Ordering, Invoice and Payment, Liquidated Damages, ADA Compliance – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10. 18/20

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

- a. Project plan lacked detail, more specifics needed.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet. 13/20

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

- a. Some answers were inconsistent or contradictory.
- b. Work examples provided were over 10 years old.

Total Score: 73/100

E. Cynerge Consulting, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Cynerge 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. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Scope and Section 1. 40/40
 The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.
2. Service Requirements, Acceptance, Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-4. 17/20

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

- a. Only 1 resume was provided, and it was not chronological.
3. Project Management, Pricing, Ordering, Invoice and Payment, Liquidated Damages, ADA Compliance – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-10. 18/20

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

- a. Project plan lacked detail, more specifics needed.
4. Vendor Questions Worksheet. 20/20
 The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.

Total Score: 95/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	Dewpoint	Exemplifi	Lyra Interactive	People Tech	Cynerge Consulting
1	Product Quality Scope and Section 1	40	38	10	25	40
2	Service Requirements, Staffing Sections 2-4	20	17	5	17	17
3	Project Management Sections 5-10	18	20	7	18	18
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet	19	19	0	13	20
	Total	97	94	22	73	95

V. Pricing Summary

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

	Deliverable	Dewpoint	Exemplifi	Cynerge
1	Monthly Cost	\$10,565.00	\$20,060.00	\$10,020.00
2	One Time Cost	\$0	\$6,000.00	\$47,850.00
	Total Annual Cost	\$126,780.00	\$246,720.00	\$168,090.00

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.

Dewpoint LLC provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include but are not limited to, the technical score, as well as the budget.

Award Recommendation is made to Dewpoint, LLC in the amount of \$126,780.00.