

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000008

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal 230000002541 Medications for Opioid Use Disorder Implementation in Jail Settings and has recommended an award to Health Management Associates in the amount of \$2,973,538.00, 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:

Emily Massa, Solicitation Manager.

Massae@michigan.gov

517-897-7321

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Medications for Opioid Use Disorder Implementation in Jail Settings. The term of this contract is three years, with up to three renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on June 28th, 2023, for five weeks total. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of August 2nd, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE*
Health Management Associates, Inc.	120 N. Washington Square, Suite 705, Lansing, MI 48933	No	No
Recovery Pathways, LLC	1009 Washington Avenue, Bay City, MI 48708	No	No
Wayne State University Center for Behavioral Health and Justice	5447 Woodward Ave, Detroit MI, 48202	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.	General Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.1	15
2.	Project Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2	25
3.	Technical Assistance and Training – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3	25
4.	Personnel - Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5-8	10
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	25
	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 the Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Emily Massa, Solicitation Manager DTMB/Central Procurement Services	Katie Abraham Policy Advisor , Office of the Chief Medical Executive
Katie Postmus, Opioid Policy Specialist , Office of the Chief Medical Executive	Brandon Hool Technical Advisor on the Opioid Settlement Funds , Office of the Chief Medical Executive
BritteNee Simpson, Justice-Involved Initiatives Specialist , Office of the Chief Medical Executive	Michelle Howe, Departmental Analyst Michigan Department of Health and Human Services Bureau of Grants and Purchasing
Angela Smith-Butterwick Substance Use, Gambling and Epidemiology Section Manager Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	Maricruz Moya Racial Equity Specialist Office of the Chief Medical Executive
Molly Welch Marahar, State Administrative Manager , Strategic	Logan O'Neil Opioid Response Program Specialist ,

Voting	Advisory
Alignment & Engagement Section, Policy & Planning Division	Substance Use, Gambling, and Epidemiology / Behavioral and Physical Health and Aging Services Administration
	Debra Pinals, Medical Director for Behavioral Health, and Forensic Programs Michigan Department of Health and Human Services
	Jared Welehodsky, State Administrative Manager Michigan Department of Health and Human Services

III. Evaluation Results

A. Recovery Pathways

The Evaluation Team determined that Recovery Pathways based on a score of 46/100, did not meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. General Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.1
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted: (6/15)
 - a. Section 1.1.A: Bidders response did not align with the requirements listed.
 - b. Section 1.1.B: Bidder did not submit sufficient evidence demonstrating comprehension of the standards stated in this section.
 - c. Section 1.1.C: Bidder did not address how their process for obtaining consent works.

2. Project Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted: (8/25)
 - a. Section 1.2.A: Bidder did not mention application for interested jails to complete. Bidders’ explanation for outreach strategies, and explanation of how they will use or share the promotional materials was deficient.
 - b. Section 1.2.B: Bidder did not explain how they will comply with requirements; no plan or metrics are specified.
 - c. Section 1.2.C: Bidder did not elaboration or provide examples on how the work is already being done or how any of their processes are laid out.
 - d. Section 1.2.D: Bidder did not provide information on how they plan to accomplish this work.
 - e. Section 1.2.E: The Bidder did not explain how they will comply with the requirements.

3. Technical Assistance and Training – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted: (16/25)
 - a. Section 1.3.A: Training specifics were not addressed. The training materials that were provided were not for correctional needs. The training was not tailored for jail settings. They also did not mention that they could provide TA for the 24 jails.
 - b. Section 1.3.B: Bidder did not describe any of the training specifics. Training materials were provided were for clinical audiences, not with a lens that correctional staff can understand.
4. Personnel -Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5-8 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted: (2/10)
 - a. Section 3.5: The bidder did not have an adequate number of staff to provide services that the State is requesting in this statement of work.
 - b. Section 4.1: Project plan provided was not specific for a statewide project. Project plan for training within the 6 months provided is not feasible or reasonable.
 - c. Section 4.3: Client tracking is not necessary. The bidder's response suggested the possibility of duplicating work they've previously undertaken. Which is out of scope for this contract.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:(18/25)
 - a. The response on the gross annual sales as it relates to the proposed pricing totals more than 25% of bidders gross annual sales last year.
 - b. Experiences 1-3 provided are not in scope.

Total Score:46/100

B. Health Management Associates

The Evaluation Team determined that Health Management Associates based on a score of 99.5/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Personnel – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5-8
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (9.5/10)
 - a. Section 7.1: The bidder did not provide a sample invoice.
2. Project Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (25/25)

3. Technical Assistance and Training – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
(25/25)
4. Personnel -Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5-8 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (10/10)
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory (25/25)

Total Score:99.5/100

C. Wayne State University – Center for Behavioral Health and Justice

The Evaluation Team determined that Wayne State University based on a score of 85/100, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. General Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.1
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (13/15)
 - a. Section 1.1.B: Bidder did not demonstrate knowledge of ACA or NCCHC.
 - b. Section 1.1.C: Bidder did not demonstrate familiarity with laws relating to recipient rights.
2. Project Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (23.75/25)
 - a. Section 1.2.A: Bidders response did not explain how they will comply with the requirements.
 - b. Section 1.2.E: Bidder did not demonstrate an ability to provide an annual report each year of the contract.
3. Technical Assistance and Training – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (15/25)
 - a. Section 1.3.A: Bidders response did not meet the requirements for number of jails to be serviced each year.
 - b. Section 1.3.B: Bidder did not address c, d or e, and utilized hyperlinks in their response which is disallowed per the proposal instructions.
4. Personnel – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5-8
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (7.75/10)
 - a. Section 3.5: Bidder did not provide full resumes.

- b. Section 4.1: Project plan did not meet the requirements of the statement of work and is inconsistent with previous answers in section 1.3.A.
 - c. Section 7.1: Bidder failed to provide invoices sample.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory (25/25)

Total Score:85/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	Weight	Recovery Pathways	Health Management Associates	Wayne State University - CBHJ
1	General Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.1	15	6	99.5	13
2	Project Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2	25	8	25	24
3	Technical Assistance and Training – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3	25	16	25	15
4	Personnel - Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5-8	10	-2	9.5	8
5	Vendor Questions Worksheet	25	18	25	25
	Total	100	46	99.5	85

V. Pricing Summary

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

	Deliverable	Health Management Associates	Wayne State University - CBHJ
1	Initial Site Visits to Participating Jails	\$283,347.00	\$735,302.00
2	Monthly Coaching	\$1,018,390.00	\$607,033.00
3	Learning Collaboratives	\$589,862.00	\$47,255.00
4	Reporting	\$70,101.00	\$148,902.00
5	Jail Recruitment and Engagement	\$134,093.00	\$123,880.00
6	Project Management	\$721,838.00	\$110,355.00
7	Indirect Costs	\$373,333.00	\$177,273.00
	Total Price	\$3,190,964.00	\$1,950,000.00

VI. Negotiations

The State of Michigan requested that Health Management Associates submit second round pricing.

Deliverable		Health Management Associates – Second Round Pricing
1	Initial Site Visits to Participating Jails	\$274,209.00
2	Monthly Coaching	\$1,274,532.00
3	Learning Collaboratives	\$568,951.00
4	Reporting	\$61,353.00
5	Jail Recruitment and Engagement	\$146,342.00
6	Project Management	\$648,151.00
7	Indirect Costs	\$0.00
Total Price		\$2,973,538.00

VII. 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.

Health Management Associates provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: experience in similar recruitment efforts, including past projects in Illinois and California, shared insights from their previous work including relevant training topics for Jail MAP, and have staff members who are experts in both custody and medical matter allowing Health Management Associated to keep up to date on the many challenges in these areas.

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 Health Management Associates in the amount of \$2,973,538.00.