

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000389

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP Proposal #240000000661 for Health Care Consulting Services and has recommended an award to Myers & Stauffer LC for Health Care Consulting Services in the amount of \$3,445,000.00, 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:

Alannah Doak, Solicitation Manager
 Doaka@michigan.gov
 517-230-9424

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Health Care Consulting Services. The term of this contract is five years, with up to two additional one-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Wednesday, December 13, 2023. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of Tuesday, January 23, 2024.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Anne Tumlinson Innovations LLC, DBA ATI Advisory	1 Thomas Circle NW Washington, DC 20005	No	No
Guidehouse Inc.	1676 International Drive, Suite 800 McLean, Virginia 22102	No	No
Remedy HealthCare Consulting LLC	5908 NW 103rd St, Kansas City MO 64154	No	No
Public Consulting Group LLC	148 State Street, 10th Floor Boston, MA 02109	No	No
Acumen, LLC	500 Airport Blvd. Ste 100 Burlingame CA 94010-1980	No	No
Myers and Stauffer LC	700 W 47th Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64112	No	No

Health Management Associates, Inc.	120 North Washington Square, Suite 705, Lansing, MI 48933	No	Yes
McKinsey & Company, Inc.	1200 19th Street NW, Suite 1000 Washington DC 20036	No	No
The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.	2715 Woodward Ave Detroit, MI 48201	No	No
Milliman, Inc.	10 W Market Street, STE 1600 Indianapolis, IN 46204	No	No
Manatt Health Strategies, LLC	Times Square Tower 7 Times Square New York, NY 10036	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

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

	Technical Evaluation Criteria – A1: Instant Game Tickets	Weight
1.	Schedule A; Statement of Work, excluding Section 3 - Staffing	30
2.	Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing	20
3.	Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections	50
	Total	100

Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The State may utilize all bidder information, without regard to a proposal’s technical score, to determine fair market value for goods or services sought. The State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal. If applicable, the State’s evaluation will include consideration of a bidder’s qualified disabled veterans/service-disabled veteran owned business(QDV/SDVOB) status under MCL 18.1261(8). Additional information on the SDVOB preference is available at: Michigan.gov/SDVOB.

The State strongly encourages strict adherence to the Contract Terms. The State reserves the right to deem a bid non-responsive for failure to accept the Contract Terms. Nevertheless, the bidder may submit proposed changes to the Contract Terms in track changes (i.e., visible edits) with an explanation of the bidder’s need for each proposed change. Failure to include track changes with an explanation of the bidder’s need for the proposed change constitutes the bidder’s acceptance of the Contract Terms. General statements, such as that the bidder reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions, may be considered non-responsive. Failure to respond timely to requests for proposed changes to Contract Terms during ongoing negotiations may be cause for disqualification.

II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting	Advisory
Alannah Doak, Solicitation Manager DTMB - Central Procurement Services	Crystal Kline, Manager – Financial & Administrative Services Section Department of Health and Human Services
Elyse Downs, Department Analyst - Financial & Administrative Services Section Department of Health and Human Services	Nathaniel Oliver, Analyst, Professional Services Purchasing Section Bureau of Grants and Purchasing Department of Health and Human Services
Christopher Lautner, Department Specialist – Financial & Administrative Services Section Department of Health and Human Services	

III. Evaluation Results

A. Anne Tumlinson Innovations LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Anne Tumlinson Innovations LLC 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing**

Score: 19.5/30

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

- a. Section 1.1.1.A Federal Health Programs/Legislation, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- b. Section 1.1.1.B Strategic Planning, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- c. Section 1.1.1.C Partnerships/Coalitions, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- d. Section 1.1.1.E Health Care Information Technology, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- e. Section 1.1.1.F Development of Management and Monitoring Structures for Contractors, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- f. Section 1.1.1.H Project Management-Health Care Related, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.

2. **Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing**

Score: 15/20

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

- a. Section 3.5.B The Contractor must identify all Key Personnel, Bidder provided Key Personnel Titles but did not describe Roles/ Responsibilities.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 40/50

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

- a. Section 5 State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP.

Total Score: 74.5/100

B. Guidehouse, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Guidehouse, Inc. based on a score of 76, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 24/30

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

- a. Section 1.1.1.A Federal Health Programs/Legislation, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- b. Section 8 Liquidated Damages, Bidder noted exception. Bidder stated, due to risk and insurance requirements, they are unable to agree to any liquidated damages.

2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 15/20

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

- a. Section 3.5.B The Contractor must identify all Key Personnel, Bidder provided Key Personnel Titles but did not describe Roles/ Responsibilities.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 37/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, bidder did not fully describe partnerships and strategic relationships they think will bring significant value to the State.
- b. Section 6 Standard Contract Terms, bidder failed to submit exceptions to the contract terms in track changes with an explanation of the bidder's need for each proposed change per section 6 of the RFP instructions.

Total Score: 76/100

C. Remedy HealthCare Consulting LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Remedy HealthCare Consulting LLC based on a score of 63, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 16/30

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

- a. Section 1.1.1.A Federal Health Programs/Legislation, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- b. Section 1.1.1.B Strategic Planning, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- c. Section 1.1.1.C Partnerships/Coalitions, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- d. Section 1.1.1.E Health Care Information Technology, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- e. Section 1.1.1.F Development of Management and Monitoring Structures for Contractors, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- f. Section 1.1.1.G Delivery System Reform, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- g. Section 1.1.1.H Project Management-Health Care Related, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.

2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 20/20

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 27/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, bidder did not fully describe partnerships and strategic relationships they think will bring significant value to the State.
- b. Section 5 State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP.

Total Score: 63/100

D. Public Consulting Group LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Public Consulting Group LLC based on a score of 91.5, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 30/30

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.

2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 20/20

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 41.5/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, bidder did not fully describe partnerships and strategic relationships they think will bring significant value to the State.
- b. Bidder exceeded page limit.

Total Score: 91.5/100

E. Acumen, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Acumen, LLC based on a score of 50, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 22/30

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

- a. Section 1.1.1.A Federal Health Programs/Legislation, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- b. Section 1.1.1.C Partnerships/Coalitions, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- c. Section 1.1.1.F Development of Management and Monitoring Structures for Contractors, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
- d. Section 1.2 Transition, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder provided they would host kick off meeting by August 15 when contract is anticipated to be executed April 1.

2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 13/20

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

- a. Section 3.7 Disclosure of Subcontractors, Bidder lacked details on the subcontractor's scope of work.
- b. Section 3.8 Security, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, Bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 15/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, Bidder did not state whether contract would increase gross revenue by more than 25%. Bidder did not fully describe partnerships and strategic relationships they think will bring significant value to the State.
- b. Section 5 State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP.

Total Score: 50/100

F. Myers and Stauffer LC

The Evaluation Team determined that Myers and Stauffer LC based on a score of 99, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing
Score: 30/30**

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.

**2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing
Score: 20/20**

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.

**3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections
Score: 49/50**

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

- a. Bidder exceeded page limit.

Total Score: 99/100

G. Health Management Associates, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Health Management Associates, Inc. based on a score of 77, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing
Score: 26/30**

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

- a. Section 1.1.1.B Strategic Planning, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.

**2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing
Score: 16/20**

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

- a. Section 3.7 Disclosure of Subcontractors, Bidder did not fully describe their relationship with the subcontractor. Bidder lacked description of the subcontractor's organization and services it would provide and information concerning the subcontractor's ability to provide the contract activities.

- b. Section 3.8 Security, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, Bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 30/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, Bidder did not state whether contract would increase gross revenue by more than 25%.
- b. Section 5 State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP.

Total Score: 72/100

H. McKinsey & Company, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that McKinsey & Company, Inc. based on a score of 84.5, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 30/30

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.

2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 15/20

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

- a. Section 3.7 Disclosure of Subcontractors, Bidder lacked details on the subcontractor's scope of work.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 39.5/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, Bidder failed to disclose five years of gross annual sales. Bidder failed to answer whether contract award would increase revenue by 25%.
- b. Section 5 State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP.
- c. Bidder exceeded page limit.

Total Score: 84.5/100

I. The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that The Boston Consulting Group, Inc. based on a score of 77.5, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 28/30

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

- a. Section 1.1.1.A Federal Health Programs/Legislation, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, Bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.

2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 20/20

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 29.5/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, Bidder did not fully describe partnerships and strategic relationships they think will bring significant value to the State.
- b. Section 5 State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP.
- c. Bidder exceeded page limit.

Total Score: 77.5/100

J. Milliman, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Milliman, Inc. based on a score of 75.3, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing

Score: 15.3/30

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

- a. Section 1.1.1.A Federal Health Programs/Legislation, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, Bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
 - b. Section 1.1.1.B Strategic Planning, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, Bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
 - c. Section 1.1.1.F Development of Management and Monitoring Structures for Contractors, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
 - d. Section 1.1.1.H Project Management-Health Care Related, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, Bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.
 - e. Bidder exceeded page limit.
- 2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing**
Score: 20/20
The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.
- 3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections**
Score: 40/50
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 5 State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP.

Total Score: 75.3/100

K. Manatt Health Strategies, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Manatt Health Strategies, LLC based on a score of 87, 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, excluding Section 3 - Staffing**
Score: 30/30
The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions. No deficiencies were noted.
- 2. Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing**
Score: 18/20
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 3.8 Security, Bidder acknowledged requirement with no exceptions. However, Bidder did not fully describe how they will meet this requirement.

3. Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections

Score: 39/50

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

- a. Section 2 Company Background Information, Bidder did not state whether contract would increase gross revenue by more than 25%.
- b. Section 6 Standard Contract Terms, Bidder failed to submit exceptions to the contract terms in track changes with an explanation of the Bidder's need for each proposed change per section 6 of the RFP instructions.
- c. Bidder exceeded page limit.

Total Score: 87/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Bidder	Schedule A; Statement of Work, excluding Section 3 - Staffing	Schedule A; Statement of Work, Section 3 - Staffing	Vendor Questions Worksheet; Company Background Information and Experience Sections	Total
Anne Tumlinson Innovations LLC, DBA ATI Advisory	19.5	15	40	74.5
Guidehouse Inc.	24	15	37	76
Remedy HealthCare Consulting LLC	16	20	27	63
Public Consulting Group LLC	30	20	41.5	91.5
Acumen, LLC	22	13	15	50
Myers and Stauffer LC	30	20	49	99
Health Management Associates, Inc.	26	16	30	72
McKinsey & Company, Inc.	30	15	39.5	84.5
The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.	28	20	29.5	77.5

Milliman, Inc.	15.3	20	40	75.3
Manatt Health Strategies, LLC	30	18	39	87

V. Pricing Summary

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

Bidder		Public Consulting Group LLC	Myers & Stauffer LC	McKinsey & Company, Inc.	Manatt Health Strategies, LLC
Deliverable	Estimated Hours per Year	Hourly Rate	Hourly Rate	Hourly Rate	Hourly Rate
Federal Health Programs/Legislation	500	\$218.00	\$265.00	\$460.00	\$580.00
Strategic Planning	500	\$218.00	\$265.00	\$685.00	\$580.00
Partnerships/Coalitions	250	\$174.00	\$265.00	\$460.00	\$580.00
Development, Evaluation and Assessment of Health Programs	300	\$218.00	\$265.00	\$460.00	\$580.00
Health Care Information Technology	300	\$194.00	\$265.00	\$754.00	\$580.00
Development of Management and Monitoring Structures for Contractors	250	\$205.00	\$265.00	\$460.00	\$580.00
Delivery System Reform	300	\$218.00	\$265.00	\$685.00	\$580.00
Project Management-Health Care Related	200	\$174.00	\$265.00	\$460.00	\$580.00
Total Yearly Price		\$536,550.00	\$689,000.00	\$1,463,977.00	\$1,508,000.00
Total Five-Year Price		\$2,682,750.00	\$3,445,000.00	\$7,319,887.00	\$7,540,000.00

VI. Negotiations

Second round pricing was offered. All four bidders offered updated pricing that is reflected in the above pricing summary table.

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.

Myers & Stauffer LC provided the best value to the State. 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. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include, significant experience across all areas of Medicaid, broad Medicaid experience as it relates to the contract requirements, experiences similar in size and scope, and extensive experience with Michigan Medicaid.

An award Recommendation is made in the following amount:

- **Myers & Stauffer LC** in the amount of \$3,445,000.00.