

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number: 260000000232**

**Notice of Intent to Award Date: 2/19/2026**

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP No. 250000002305 for Vision Insurance Administration Services and has recommended an award to EyeMed Vision Care, LLC in the amount of \$37,500,000.00, 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:

Mary Ostrowski, Solicitation Manager

ostrowskim@michigan.gov

(517)249-0438

**Public copies of all bidder proposals can be found here:** [DTMB - Bid Proposals \(michigan.gov\)](#)

**Background Information:**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Vision Insurance Administration Services for eligible State employees, retirees, dependents, and COBRA participants. The term of this contract is three years and five months, with up to seven additional one-year renewal options. The Contract is to be effective April 1, 2026, through September 30, 2029. April 1, 2026, through September 30, 2026, is the implementation period and services are to begin without interruption on October 1, 2026. No payment will be made to the Contractor during the implementation period. The implementation period begins with Contract award date through the Plan Effective Date.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on June 25, 2025, for five weeks. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of July 30, 2025.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
<b>Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan</b>	600 E. Lafayette Blvd. Detroit, MI 48226	No	Yes
<b>EyeMed Vision Care, LLC</b>	4000 Luxottica Place, Mason, OH 45040	No	No

<b>Heritage Vision Plans, Inc.</b>	1 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2020 Detroit, MI 48226	No	Yes
<b>Vision Service Plan</b>	3333 Quality Dr. Rancho Cordova, CA 95670	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: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

**6. MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:** To avoid disqualification, the bidder must provide documentation to support the following:

6.1 The Contractor, which includes any of its subcontractors, must be a licensed Third Party Administrator (TPA) in the State of Michigan, or insurance company licensed to do business in Michigan, or must qualify in any other capacity as an entity that is properly licensed by statute to provide administrative services only and cost-plus arrangements, or to act as a TPA. Contractor must provide proof of licensure to the State for itself and any subcontractors prior to functioning as a TPA, including any renewals. See also Proposal Instructions Section 6 Mandatory Minimum Requirements. Refer to **Schedule A, Section 1.1.2** for the associated requirement and Bidder response area.

6.2 The Contractor must ensure Transparency and Pass-Through Pricing for all Services provided. Refer to **Schedule A, Section 1.1.5** for the associated requirement and Bidder response area.

6.3 Contractor must fully implement the Plan Sponsor’s Plan Design in accordance with **Schedule F**. Refer to **Schedule A, Section 1.2.1** for the associated requirement and Bidder response area.

Only proposals meeting the mandatory minimum requirements will be considered for evaluation.

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

**7. EVALUATION PROCESS.** If all mandatory minimums are met, the State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A (EXCLUDING Sections: 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements, Sections 1.4.)	46
2.	Schedule A, Section 4. Staffing	10
3.	Schedule A, Section 5. Project Management, Section 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements	9
4.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4 (includes Schedule H GeoAccess) (EXCLUDING 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis)	10

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
5.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis (includes Schedule M Vision Disruption Analysis)	13
7.	Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 5 Prior Experience	12
	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 a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Mary Ostrowski, Category Specialist Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB), Central Procurement Services (CPS)	Scott Wager, Senior Business Relations Administrator DTMB Agency Services
Becky Guyski, State Division Administrator Michigan Civil Service Commission (MCSC), Employee Benefits Division (EBD)	Mike Bartkowiak, Information Technology Specialist, DTMB Michigan Cyber Security (MCS)
Chris DeRose, State Administrative Manager MCSC, EBD	
Una Kos, Departmental Specialist MCSC, EBD	
Jacob Brown, Michigan State Employees Association (MSEA)	
Daniel Hengesbach, State Assistant Administrator Office of State Employer (OSE)	
Courtney Landon, Departmental Analyst DTMB, Office of Retirement Services (ORS)	

**III. Evaluation Results**

**A. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (BCBSM)**

Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 6. (No points deducted):

- Bidder provided redlines to Hybrid Contract Terms.  
Bidder provided redlines to Schedule E Data Security requirements.

The Evaluation Team determined that BCBSM based on a score of 54, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Schedule A (EXCLUDING Sections: 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements, Sections 1.4.)  
 35/46**

- A. Overall/all areas of proposal: Bidder's proposal would require extensive clarification to understand true agreement to requirements, as JEC witnessed significant variances between this proposal and that of their subcontractor's separate proposal. No points were deducted:  
 1.2.1, 1.5.3.3.1, 1.6.1.1.2, 1.6.1.5, 1.8.1, 1.8.2, 1.8.5, 1.8.10
- B. Schedule A and all areas of proposal: In multiple areas of Bidder's proposal, Bidder indicates "Blue Vision members" and is unclear whether Bidder is willing to use alternative language such as State Vision Plan members. No points deducted.
- C. 1.1.11: Bidder did not provide a copy of their independent ratings of financial strength with their proposal and instead provided links, which are not allowed according to Proposal Instructions, Section 1.
- D. 1.1.13: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and provided significant redlines to the referenced Sections 36 and 37 in Hybrid Contact terms.
- E. 1.1.14: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and provided redlines on the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) Business Associate Agreement (BAA).
- F. 1.3.13: Bidder referenced MPSERS in the detail for handling overpayment and recoveries not clear. No points deducted.
- G. 1.5.1:
  - Bidder did not agree to this requirement and did not list their exceptions in the exceptions box as required. The details provided in their plan for meeting the requirement indicated adjustment to timing of customer services center opening time of 9:00AM instead of the required 8:00AM.
  - Bidder stated "VSP accepts full responsibility for third parties who perform services on our behalf", but Bidder (BCBSM) must be the responsible party; not their subcontractor.
  - Bidder's response was confusing due to a discrepancy between Contractor and subcontractor roles. No points deducted.
- H. 1.5.3.3: Bidder agreed to this requirement, but in section 1.5.13 (which is about written correspondence), Bidder's detail indicated they do not record outgoing calls. No points deducted.
- I. 1.5.10: Bidder did not provide their plan for meeting the requirement and instead provided links to view which is not allowed according to Proposal Instructions, Section 1.
- J. 1.5.13:
  - Bidder's plan for meeting the requirement is not specific to written correspondence and instead speaks to calls.

- It was unclear if Bidder was implying the representatives aren't all located in the US by stating "remote customer service reps connect to U.S.-based Customer Experience Center with a virtual private network (VPN)". No points deducted.
- K. 1.7.4. and 1.7.15: Bidder agreed to the requirement in 1.7.4 but in 1.7.15 stated "The 834 full file is audited against BCBS membership and changes are loaded to the eligibility system." which contradicts 1.7.4. Per 1.7.4., changes only files are sent on a biweekly basis. Full files for the Vision contract are not acceptable other than during quarterly audits. No points deducted.
- L. 1.8.4: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated limitations by stating "Claim audits are limited claims paid within the previous 24 months with a sample size of 200 claims."
- M. 1.8.9: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and capped audit costs, stating "Blue Cross agrees to cover up to \$37,500 of the audit cost."
- N. 1.9.1., 1.9.3, 1.9.4, 1.9.5:
- Bidder did not provide a copy of VSP's SOC report and also indicated that their subcontractor is not required to have a SOC 1 Type 2 report. This contract requires that for subcontractors, Contractor must obtain and review SOC 1 Type 2 and SOC 2 Type 2 and any audit report that is used to demonstrate compliance with the Contract and Data Security requirements in Schedule E. These reports must be provided to the State upon request.
  - Bidder agreed to all of these requirements but would not be able to meet them without having agreement as it pertained to their subcontractor's SOC report. No points deducted.
- O. 1.10: Bidder referenced MPSERS in their response detail. No points deducted.
- P. Schedule J Service Availability: Bidder did not complete and submit -Schedule J. No points deducted.
- Q. 2.5: Bidder did not provide details for how they will meet the ADA requirements. Bidder also only addresses the member portal, but the requirement references documentation provided as well. Bidder does not indicate whether or not it agrees to ensure documentation provided will be ADA compliant as well.
- R. Section 2.6 and Schedule G, Cell C15: Bidder's detail was unclear on whether their upgrade from Struts to Angular is completed. No points deducted.
- S. 2.10.1:
- Bidders RTO does not match RTO in Schedule D and is over the requirement (as stated in the provided VSP DR plan). It was unclear if Bidder would meet the required RTO and RPO due to this discrepancy. No points deducted.
  - Bidder did not provide a sufficiently detailed Disaster Recovery plan for VSP; instead, it was high level.
  - Bidder did not sufficiently explain how BCBSM and VSP portals will interact with one another and whether it is a redirect from BCBSM to VSP, is one a primary, is one a secondary, etc.
- T. 2.12.

- Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated they use their own methodology.
  - Bidder response box 1: Bidder did not demonstrate how each PMM/SEM requirement will be met or submit an example document if proposing to use their own documents as a substitute.
  - Bidder response box 2: Bidder did not describe how they will meet the requirements set forth in this section and note any exceptions.
- U. 3.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated redlines in Hybrid Contract Terms; however, Bidder did not redline anything in Hybrid Contract Terms Section 20. No points deducted.
- V. 8: Bidder did not agree to the liquidated damages requirement; instead, Bidder indicated coming up with mutual language agreeable by both parties.
- W. 9.6.1. SLA #1A & 1B Identification Cards: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, declining the ID SLA completely.
- X. 9.6.7. SLA #7 Reporting: Bidder did not respond to this requirement; leaving both Bidder boxes unchecked.
- Y. 9.6.10. SLA #10 Claims Turn Around: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and adjusted the SLA to 15 days instead of ten and with additional stats of 95% within 5 days.

**2. Schedule A, Section 4. Staffing  
 1/10**

- A. 4.3.11: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and made indication of wanting to align with a different state contract which has lower values set and different language.
- B. 4.3.12 TABLE and 4.3.13 RESUME:
- Senior Account Manager:
    1. Bidder's resume for Senior Account Manager does not support data in table indicating 30 years of experience in current classification. No points deducted.
    2. Bidder's intent of stating 100% of work time is unclear. This implies that he won't work on any other client's account. No points deducted."
  - Back-Up Senior Account Manager:
    1. Bidder did not indicate percent of work time and indicated "Depends on priorities between medical and vision contracts. allocates accordingly".
    2. JEC concern that resume for her current role doesn't support accurate experience as vision and dental is referenced; indicated "handle all lines of business including medical, pharmacy, dental, vision and all ancillary lines " for her current role but that's not accurate. No points deducted.
    3. Spelling errors in resume. No points deducted.
  - Implementation Manager:
    1. Bidder did not indicate percent of work time; Bidder indicated that percent of work time will depend on workgroup priorities.

2. Bidder did not provide sufficient detail of roles and responsibilities for proposed Implementation Manager Kelly Barlage-Hulbert by only stating Project Manager for Internal group MOS system platform.
  3. Proposed staff data does not align between the Key Personnel Table detail and the provided resume: Table says 5yrs in current classification, but resume shows 2008 - present. No points deducted.
- Call Center Manager:
    1. Roles and Responsibilities were not provided for this Key Personnel, instead it provides background experience-type information.
    2. No resume provided for this Key Personnel.
    3. Bidder's intent of stating 100% of work time is unclear. This implies that she won't work on any other client's account, which based on her role, doesn't align. No points deducted.
  - Technical Support Specialist: Bidder's intent for Technical Support and those in Other field in Key Personnel is unclear; the State's intent is not to have the technical support role be considered key personnel. No points deducted.
- C. 4.4.3. Non-Key Staff Table:
- Technical Support Specialist:
    1. Bidder intent of stating 100% of work time for this contract is unclear for this Technical Support Specialist Sonya Mathis. This individual also serves in a separate role for the CSC health contract. No points deducted.
    2. Roles and responsibilities provided for proposed Technical Support Specialist do not support sufficient duties on this vision contract. This specialist must, at a minimum but not limited to, be directly accessible by the Plan Sponsor for all needed technical consulting, and must possess expertise in enrollment and eligibility file processing and provide claim data feed support.
  - Client Support Representative Role (Ronda Guy-Wright):
    1. Roles and responsibilities for this position only states State of Michigan reporting SLAs, which is not sufficient detail and does not align with state's intent of the role. This representative must, at a minimum but not limited to, assist the SAM with eligibility questions and urgent updates, member claim questions, processing of prescription safety glasses requests and portal access requests.
    2. Bidder's intent of stating 100% of work time is unclear for proposed Client Support Representative role. This individual serves in a separate role for the CSC health contract. No points deducted.
- D. 4.4.9: Bidder's response regarding what performance standards are required by staff function in terms of productivity, accuracy, timeliness and customer relations included footnotes that were not defined or explained.
- E. 4.5: Bidder's proposed Implementation Manager Kelly was not listed on the Organizational Chart.

- F. 4.6: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, indicating customer service call center would have a start time of 9:00AM instead of 8:00AM.
- G. 4.8: Bidder agreed to this requirement; however, in the Section 4.6 requirement, Bidder indicated Customer Service hours would not begin until 9:00AM. It is unclear who of BCBSM /VSP staff are available beginning at 8:00AM. No points deducted.
- H. 4.9. Disclosure of Subcontractors:
  - Bidder indicated VSP is performing 100% of the contract activities, which is inaccurate and not in alignment with all proposal details (example: a number of BCBSM staff are listed as Key Personnel).
  - Bidder's Schedule G references industry leading suppliers and third parties which were not disclosed upfront in proposal.
- I. 4.10:
  - Bidder referenced MPSERS which was unclear by stating "However Blue Cross employees will comply with the rules set forth by MPSERS when entering their facilities". No points deducted.
  - Bidder did not address use of uniforms.

**3. Schedule A, Section 5. Project Management, Section 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements**  
**4/9**

- A. 5.6.1:
  - Bidder made "Best of Health" references in Section 8 which was unclear. No points deducted.
  - Bidder made reference to ORS throughout their response and had reference to MPSERS on their issue log. No points deducted.
  - Bidder's implementation plan did not indicate Bidder will perform a final disruption plan (Section 5.6.1. #10).
  - Bidder's implementation plan indicated that the plan for initial feed is not until go live date of 10/1/26: Receive history files from EyeMed Initial Load (SOW: 5.2.6.h.) ROW 42.
- B. 5.8.3.6: Bidder did not agree to this site visit requirement and capped expenses at \$5,000.
- C. 5.9.4: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated that they do not have real time online reporting access.
- D. 5.9.8.1.5.1: Bidder agreed to this requirement, but in Section 1.9.1 indicated they are not able to provide SOC 1 Type 2 for subcontractors. No points deducted.
- E. 7.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement of keeping the pricing firm for the entire length of the contract and indicated they want to reserve the right to change the administrative fee if a change in more or less than 10% of enrollment occurs during the contract period.
- F. 7.9: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated they have a system limitation on division level billing.

**4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4 (includes Schedule H GeoAccess) (EXCLUDING 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis)**

**4/10**

- A. 1.4.2: Bidder's process did not address monitoring; it only addressed credentialing and re-credentialing.
- B. 1.4.4: Bidder's GeoAccess Report in Schedule H illustrated a lower percentage in Retail locations ( for Urban - 77.0%; Rural - 86.2%) as well as Ophthalmologists (for – Rural - 77%); these are the key areas where Bidder does not have adequate access (and will not commit to improving by contract start date / within 6 months per Section 1.4.5 below).  
1.4.5: Bidder did not agree to this requirement. Bidder did not explain their process to add providers to the network and did not provide their plan for improving provider access in any areas where the access standard is not met.
- C. 1.4.8: JEC concern with members having to login to Bidder's portal in order to simply access a provider directory and the lack of other options being listed, such as site that doesn't require login, inclusion in a welcome kit, via an app, and/or being able to call customer service to request this information. No points deducted.
- D. 1.4.9:
- Bidder response made reference to MPSERS which was unclear. No points deducted.
  - Bidder did not address ensuring the accurate administration of the State Vision Plan by their network providers.

**5. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis (includes Schedule M Vision Disruption Analysis)**

**4/13**

- A. 1.4.11: Bidder's Disruption Analysis indicated nearly a quarter of the Active member population would experience a disruption (23.8%) and exceeds the 20% threshold outlined in the requirement; a moderate disruption would occur for the Retiree population (15.3%). Additionally, a quarter of both the Active and Retiree population's providers would experience a disruption.

**6. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 5 Prior Experience**

**6/12**

- A. 5.1 Experience 1
- Bidder did not provide sufficient detail on the role their company played.
  - Bidder's experience was not relevant in size based on the dollar value listed, which is a fraction of the value of the State Vision Plan contract.
  - Bidder's detail indicates this was a renewal, but Bidder did not disclose dates of prior contract as well as a detailed explanation.
- B. 5.2 Experience 2
- Bidder did not provide sufficient detail on the role their company played.

- Bidder's experience was highly irrelevant in size based on the dollar value listed, which was significantly smaller than the value of the State Vision Plan contract.
- Bidder's detail indicates this was a renewal, but Bidder did not disclose dates of prior contract as well as a detailed explanation.

C. 5.3 Experience 3

- Bidder did not provide sufficient detail on the role their company played.
- Bidder's experience was highly irrelevant in size based on the dollar value listed, which was significantly smaller than the value of the State Vision Plan contract.
- Bidder's detail indicates this was a renewal, but Bidder did not disclose dates of prior contract as well as a detailed explanation.

**Total Score: 54 /100**

**B. EyeMed**

Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 6. (No points deducted):

- Bidder provided redlines to Hybrid Contract Terms, in Bidder's initial response.
- Bidder provided redlines to Schedule E Data Security requirements, in Bidder's initial response.

The Evaluation Team determined that EyeMed based on a score of 91, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Schedule A (EXCLUDING Sections: 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements, Sections 1.4.)  
 42/46**

- 1.1.10: Bidder did not agree to this requirement in Bidder's initial response; exception pertained to a referenced section/different requirement.
- 1.1.11: Bidder provided a financial report for parent company rather than EyeMed.
- 1.1.13: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and provided redlines to Hybrid Contract Terms Section 36, in Bidder's initial response.
- 1.1.14: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and provided redlines to the Exhibit 2 to Schedule E HIPAA BAA, in Bidder's initial response.
- 1.5.3.3: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated "While we cannot attach member's call recordings to their account, we can locate and listen to all member calls upon request", in Bidder's initial response.
- 1.5.10: Bidder's plan included links to view in response which is not allowed according to Proposal Instructions.
- 1.5.12: Bidder stated "While we cannot attach member's chats to their account, we can locate and review member chats upon request" which aligns with the requirement. No points deducted.

- H. 1.5.13: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and referenced exception to members call recordings which is not applicable here, in Bidder's initial response.
- I. 1.9.4: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated they would not provide the report itself but only attestations, in Bidder's initial response.
- J. 2.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and adjusted the language about complying with all applicable State IT policies and standards, with adjusted wording of "significantly similar".
- K. 2.8 and Schedule G: Bidder did not discuss their strategy for keeping major software revisions (for example, how long does it take to apply an emergency security patch).
- L. 2.10.1:
  - Bidder provided redlines to Schedule D. Redlines were resolved or mutually negotiated to alternate language in clarifications and negotiations.
  - Bidder did not provide sufficiently detailed Disaster Recovery information, in Bidder's initial response.
- M. 2.10.2: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, however the provided redlines were to a referenced section, not Section 2.10.2 specifically.
- N. 2.12: Bidder did not agree to this requirement regarding the SUITE framework and indicated use of their own methodology.

**2. Schedule A, Section 4. Staffing  
 9/10**

- A. 4.3.12 and 4.3.13: Bidder listed Katy Vollmer in Key Personnel Table in the "Other" row as Director of Strategic Account Management but did not provide this individual's resume, in Bidder's initial response.
- B. 4.9: Bidder did not provide percentages for "Of the total Contract Activities provided by the Bidder (Contractor) for this Contract, the percentage of work performed by the subcontractor" and instead stated "Our subcontractors are utilized across our entire book of business, so there is no way to identify and report on the percentage of this contract spend on a particular vendor."

**3. Schedule A, Section 5. Project Management, Section 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements  
 8/9**

- A. 5.9.6.6: Bidder checked that they do not agree to this requirement, but the referenced exception was to a different section, not specifically 5.9.6.6 in Bidder's initial response.
- B. 7.9: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, due to the indication that they are not offering a prompt payment discount. No points deducted.

**4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4 (includes Schedule H GeoAccess) (EXCLUDING 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis)  
 10/10**

Bidder met the requirements of this Section without exception.

**5. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4.11.  
Disruption Analysis (includes Schedule M Vision Disruption Analysis)  
13/13**

Bidder met the requirements of this Section without exception.

**6. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 5 Prior Experience  
9/12**

A. 5.1 Experience 1:

- Bidder did not provide dollar value and stated confidential and proprietary, in Bidder's initial response.
- Bidder did not provide month and year start and end dates as required, in Bidder's initial response.

B. 5.2 Experience 2:

- Bidder did not provide contact phone number, in Bidder's initial response.
- Bidder did not provide dollar value and stated confidential and proprietary, in Bidder's initial response.
- Bidder did not provide month and year start and end dates as required, in Bidder's initial response.

C. 5.3 Experience 3:

- Bidder did not provide dollar value and stated confidential and proprietary, in Bidder's initial response.
- Bidder did not provide month and year start and end dates as required, in Bidder's initial response.

**Total Score: 91 /100**

**C. Heritage Vision**

Bidder's proposal included formatting errors in the RFP numbering in Schedule A, Section 4.9 and Section 6 through the end of Schedule A. No points deducted.

The Evaluation Team determined that Heritage Vision, based on a score of 68, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Schedule A (EXCLUDING Sections: 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 7.  
Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements, Sections 1.4.)  
38/46**

A. 1.1.11: Bidder provided financials for Heritage Vision Services TPA Inc and not Heritage Vision Plans Inc.

B. 1.2.2: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated: Fees subject to adjustment in the event of changes to plan allowances/benefits, contributions, and/or the number of eligible employees (+/-25%); or any future additional tax, fee or assessment imposed by the federal or state governments with associated costs.

- C. 1.3.13: Bidder's procedures did not include notifying Plan Sponsor in advance as stated in requirement.
- D. 1.5.1: Bidder's plan did not include average staffing.
- E. 1.5.3.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement, indicating the number will be unified for members and providers, instead of separate as required.
- F. 1.6.1.6: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and issuing ID cards as needed; instead, they will only issue ID cards annually with additional cards needing to be downloaded from a website.
- G. 1.9.1: Bidder did not provide a copy of their most recent SOC 1 Type 2 report(s) for the contractor (and any subcontractor that would provide service significant to the State such as claims processing); only a SOC 2 Type 2 report for their subcontractor was provided.
- H. 1.9.2: Bidder checked that they did not agree to this requirement language, and did not sufficiently explain their exception, as the content of the exception speaks more so to Section 1.9.1.
- I. 2.4: Bidder did not provide a list of all features accessible via mobile device.
- J. 2.6: The technology used to develop the front end, developed end, database of Skygen was unclear. No points deducted.
- K. 2.8 and Schedule G:
- Rows 23 and 24: Bidder did not answer as required by stating that they are not a developer.
  - Row 27: Bidder did not complete this row as required and instead stated not applicable for all 4 columns.
- L. 2.10.1.and Schedule G:
- Bidder's DR plan does not encompass software used under this contract; since Skygen is a software provider, Bidder should have provided Skygen's DR.
  - Bidder's response to the Skygen outage which is referenced in Schedule G 2.10 lacks reference to backup of Skygen data at the Heritage location. Bidder also mentioned Detroit Michigan back-up, but what Bidder would do in a disaster is not included in Bidder's DR plan.
  - Bidder did not disclose all required Schedule G information for Smart Data Solutions (SDS) (SDS should have its own column). In addition, Bidder's DR plan does not sufficiently address SDS.
  - Bidder's proposal does not sufficiently address the relationship of Skygen to SDS.
- M. Schedule J Service Availability report:
- Name of software was not referenced on the provided Service Availability Report. No points deducted.
  - Bidder did not include SDS on this report. No points deducted.
- N. 2.10.2 and Schedule G: SKYGEN's SOC II-audited Disaster Recovery Plan is referenced in Schedule G row 34 but was not provided with Bidder's proposal. The

Exhibit 1 to Schedule E file provided with the proposal does not cover storage or restoration of data.

- O. 2.11 Bidder did not respond to all requirements and questions in Schedule A Section 2 and Schedule G for SDS.
- P. 2.12:
  - Bidder did not provide the required information for the first detail box (demonstrating how each PMM/SEM requirement would be met).
  - Bidder did not describe how they will meet the requirements outlined in the box above it.

**2. Schedule A, Section 4. Staffing**  
**2/10**

- A. 4.3.13:
  - For all proposed Key Personnel, Bidder provided brief biographies instead of chronological resumes as required.
  - Proposed staff data does not align between the Key Personnel Table detail and the provided bios. For all Key Personnel listed, the Table indicates a different number of years in current classification, than what the bios reflect. No points deducted.
- B. 4.4:
  - Bidder did not populate the Physical Location field for the Technical Support Rep position,
  - Bidder did not populate the Physical Location field for the Client Support Rep position.
  - Bidder did not populate the Direct/Sub, FT/PT, % of Work Time, or Physical Location fields for the Provider Relations position.
- C. 4.4.5: Detail box 1: Bidder did not provide the number of people and experience level of the customer service team composition.
- D. 4.4.9:
  - Detail box 1: JEC concern that the provided average speed of answer and abandoned call rates do not meet the performance standard for this contract in those areas.
  - Detail box 3: Bidder did not explain how staff is evaluated and instead stated frequency only.
- E. 4.5: Bidder did not include all subcontractors on their organizational chart such as Skygen and SDS.
- F. 4.9: Bidder did not disclose Skygen (referred to in Schedule A, Section 2.6/Schedule G) as a subcontractor.
- G. 4.10:
  - Bidder Box 1: Bidder did not sufficiently explain how they intend to ensure security of State facilities (e.g., performing background checks).
  - Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not address use of ID badges.

**3. Schedule A, Section 5. Project Management, Section 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements**

**8/9**

- A. 5.6.1: Bidder did not provide a sufficiently detailed calendar/timeline/schedule for the Implementation Period; instead, it was very high level.

**4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4 (includes Schedule H GeoAccess) (EXCLUDING 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis)**

**6/10**

- A. 1.4.4. GeoAccess Report:
- Bidder's GeoAccess Report in Schedule H illustrates a low percentage in Ophthalmologists, with Suburban and Rural being extremely low (for Suburban – 54.78%; Rural – 41.49%) - these are the key areas where Bidder does not have adequate access.
  - JEC concern with bidder indicating yes to having providers and retail locations in invalid zip code areas (e.g., 40929 and 44852).

**5. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis (includes Schedule M Vision Disruption Analysis)**

**6/13**

- A. 1.4.11 Disruption Analysis:  
Bidder's Disruption Analysis indicated 30.10% of the Retiree member population would experience a disruption and exceeds the 20% threshold outlined in the requirement. Additionally, 37.59% of the Retiree population's providers would experience a disruption.

**6. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 5 Prior Experience**

**8/12**

- A. 5.1 Experience 1: Bidder's experience was not relevant in size based on the dollar value listed, which was significantly smaller than the value of the State Vision Plan contract.
- B. 5.2 Experience 2:
- Bidder's experience was not relevant in size based on the dollar value listed, which was significantly smaller than the value of the State Vision Plan contract.
  - Bidder's experience does not represent similar duration in successfully administering a plan of similar size and scope, given that the experience is new and just beginning in 2025.
- C. 5.3 Experience 3: Bidder's experience was not relevant in size based on the dollar value listed, which was significantly smaller than the value of the State Vision Plan contract.

**Total Score: 68 /100**

**D. VSP**

Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 6. (No points deducted):

- Bidder provided redlines to Hybrid Contract Terms and proposed replacement with their terms.
- Bidder provided redlines to Schedule E Data Security requirements.
- Bidder provided an additional security addendum titled Attachment M which was referenced in Hybrid Contract Terms.
- Bidder provided an additional data processing agreement titled Attachment N Data Processing agreement which was referenced in Hybrid Contract Terms Section 11(as Attachment O).

The Evaluation Team determined that VSP, based on a score of 57, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Schedule A (EXCLUDING Sections: 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements, Sections 1.4.)  
 29/46**

- A. 1.1.13: Bidder provided redlines to Hybrid Contract Terms Section 37 and indicated the following in both Section 36 and 37:  
 VSP respectfully requests all our Clients review VSP’s more applicable Data Security Addendum as it contains all the assurance and aligns with the expectations here in this language upon award of the bid to guarantee adherence to all requirements.
- B. 1.1.14: Bidder did not agree to this requirement; Bidder indicated that they want modifications to the HIPAA Business Associate Agreement (BAA), but did not provide them as redlines, instead provided commentary.
- C. 1.3.13:
- Bidder did not agree to this requirement; Bidder indicated they do not provide advance notification of any overpayments and recoveries that directly impact members and also are not indicating that approval will be obtained from the Plan Sponsor prior to notification to members for recoveries and overpayments.
  - JEC concern with bidder stating, “Due to the relatively low claim dollars associated with routine eye care, VSP chooses not to exercise its subrogation rights.”
- D. 1.5.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement language but did not indicate what the exception is. In Bidder's plan, the call center start time is indicated to be 9:00AM (requirement is 8:00AM).
- E. 1.5.3.3: Bidder agreed to this requirement, but it contradicts with Section 1.5.3.3.1 where Bidder indicated they do not record outbound calls. No points deducted.
- F. 1.5.3.3.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement:
- Instead of complying with the 12-month requirement, Bidder stated they keep screen captures for about 90 days and keep audio files for about a year.

- Since Bidder is not recording outbound, they are not keeping outbound for 12 months as required.
  - Bidder didn't agree to retain calls for appeal or grievance purposes longer than 12 months.
- G. 1.5.5: Bidder agreed to the requirement, but Bidder's response did not describe how they plan to meet the requirement (how they plan to make the improvements).
- H. 1.5.10: Bidder did not provide their written plan for meeting the requirement, instead Bidder provided links to suffice as the plan (links not allowed according to Proposal Instructions).
- I. 1.5.13:
- Bidder's plan for meeting the requirement is not specific to written correspondence and instead speaks to calls.
  - It is unclear if Bidder is implying the representatives aren't all located in the US by stating "remote customer service reps connect to U.S.-based Customer Experience Center with a virtual private network (VPN)". No points deducted.
- J. 1.6.1.1.2: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicates that the Plan Sponsor is not allowed to review and approve the reimbursement and claim forms.
- K. 1.6.1.5:
- Bidder did not agree to this requirement.
  - What is explained is a different prescription safety glasses plan design than what is required by this contract; it is unclear if Bidder is proposing to use a different plan design. Bidder references lens and frame replacement every 24 months, where this Contract's plan design requires replacement every 24 months or 12 months if Rx changes. The Plan Design must also cover bifocals, trifocals & lenticular lenses, which is not referenced in Bidder's response. No points deducted.
- L. 1.7.15: Bidder's provided processes did not support/align with the discrepancy procedure as stated in the requirement and did not support that the format defined by Plan Sponsor will be used.
- M. 1.8.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, indicating a limitation to the audit and amount of test claims.
- N. 1.8.2: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated they need 90 days prior written notification or 60 days notification for a desktop audit and also don't agree to onsite audits.
- O. 1.8.5: Bidder did not agree to this requirement of providing any requested data elements required to complete a benefit and claims audit within 30 days and instead responded with "VSP will provide audit documents to MCSC within sixty (60) days written notification to performing a desktop audit annually or otherwise as required by regulatory agencies, state and/or federal law."
- P. 1.8.8: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and the provided exception did not address the intent of the requirement which is the manner in which any applicable credit will be applied. When there are instances in which the State of Michigan has

been overcharged or undercharged by the Contractor, an invoice credit or debit must occur.

- Q. 1.8.10: Bidder did not agree to this requirement of full onsite auditability; Bidder indicated due to adopting a distributed workforce model where the majority of their staff now work remotely, they offer a modified audit option where clients can visit their headquarters, but not all applicable staff would be onsite, and do not conduct office tours.
- R. 1.9.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and stated SOC 1 Type 2 is N/A since they are not a public company.
- S. 1.9.3: Bidder did not agree to this requirement regarding corrective action plan if SOC has qualifications.
- T. 1.9.4: Bidder did not agree to this requirement regarding SOC reports for subcontractors.
- U. 1.9.5: Bidder did not agree to this requirement regarding annual attestations for subcontractor's SOC reports.
- V. 1.9.6: Bidder did not agree to this requirement; Bidder's exception appears to limit the additional information pertaining to internal controls related to services performed.
- W. 2.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement on IT complying with State IT policies and standards and instead indicated they will meet the spirit and intent.
- X. 2.2: Bidder did not agree to this requirement which as stated would only apply "to the extent the contractor has access".
- Y. 2.3: Bidder did not agree to this requirement; Bidder expresses digital standards requirements to be not applicable because they are not developing a custom application.
- Z. 2.4: Bidder did not agree to this Mobile Responsiveness requirement expressing "Please note that VSP will not be developing a custom application for or on behalf of MCSC as part of this engagement". Regardless of whether Bidder is developing a custom application or not, responsive design practices must be utilized to ensure their portal is accessible via a mobile device.
- AA. 2.5:
  - Bidder did not agree to this requirement and did not provide a sufficient plan for how they will meet ADA compliance.
  - Bidder indicated they cannot subject any changes to the approval of any one client.
  - Bidder provided a link in their proposal response for this section which is not allowed per Proposal Instructions.
- BB. 2.6. and Schedule G:
  - Regarding Bidder's portal for the Plan Sponsor, it was unclear whether the initiative of containerization and auto-scalability is complete. It was also unclear if that was also completed for the member portal or if there is a schedule to complete that for the member portal. No points deducted.

- CC. Cell C15: Bidder's detail was unclear on whether their upgrade from Struts to Angular is completed. No points deducted.

2.7. and Schedule G:

  - Bidder did not agree to this requirement. Bidder's provided detail appears to agree, and sufficient explanation of the exception was not provided.
  - Bidder's detail in Schedule G is inconsistent with what was stated Schedule A, Section 2.7, and is unclear if federation with the State's SSO is supported. No points deducted.
- DD. 2.8. and Schedule G:

  - Bidder did not agree to this End-User Operating Environment requirement.
  - Row 27 on Schedule G referenced BCBSMI which was confusing. No points deducted.
- EE. 2.10.1. and Schedule G:

  - Bidder did not agree to this requirement and submitted redlines to Schedule D.
  - Schedule G, row 28, column C, D, E: It was unclear whether this is hosted by VSP or by Magnolia CMS and unclear what Magnolia CMS's role is. No points deducted.
  - Bidder agreed to RTO and RPO in Schedule D, but if the software/portals provided are mission critical, it did not align with RTO and RPO stated in their DR plan of RPO ≤ 5 minutes RTO ≤ 24 hours for Mission-Critical. It was unclear if Bidder can meet RTO and RPO of 4 hours as required. No points deducted.
  - Bidder's DR plan doesn't appear to cover/reference Magnolia CMS.
- FF. 2.10.2. and Schedule G:

  - Bidder's comments in Schedule E are not accurate or do not align with Bidder's content in Schedule G because Bidder uses 11:11 solutions. No points deducted.
- GG. 2.11. and Schedule G:

  - Bidder did not agree to this requirement and Bidder did not provide sufficient explanation as to what level they would want to make modifications based on their response; Bidder response indicates their policies may override State policies based on Bidder stating they won't "commit to the immediate or complete deletion".
  - Bidder's provided Schedule J Service Availability Report only listed member portal, not other portals/software as required. No points deducted.
- HH. 2.12:

  - Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated they believe it's not applicable.
  - Bidder did not demonstrate how each PMM/SEM requirement will be met or submit an example document if proposing to use their own documents as a substitute.

- Bidder did not describe how they will meet the requirements set forth in this section.
- II. 9.6.6. SLA #6: Member Satisfaction Survey: Bidder did not agree to this SLA requirement; Bidder takes exception to the statement: Survey tool, methodology, and scoring criteria must be mutually agreed upon within the first three months of Contract effective date.”
- JJ. 9.6.11. SLA #11A & 11B: Eligibility Files: Bidder did not agree to this SLA requirement and indicated:
- Bidder stated they “would need some flexibility around the 98% accuracy requirement” (Account Administration).
  - Bidder proposed that this metric be measured on a quarterly basis rather than the required weekly measurement period.
  - Bidder’s Enrollment Verification Report (EVR) does not confirm records reported as an error that has not had any action taken. This contract requires the Contractor to have validation edits in place to ensure, for each data load, that all fields transmitted by the State are properly uploaded, read, and populated in the Contractor’s system. Any records that do not pass Contractor’s validation tests must be reported to the Plan Sponsor within two business days after the file has been uploaded. All discrepancy reporting must be in the format defined by the Plan Sponsor.

**2. Schedule A, Section 4. Staffing**  
**1/10**

- A. 4.3.12., 4.3.13, 4.4.1 and 4.4.3:
- In Bidder’s Key Personnel table, Bidder indicated 100% work time listed for all Key Personnel to this Contract, which is inaccurate for Tina Hemphill since she’s listed in multiple roles, and improbable that the other individuals listed will be solely dedicated to this contract and not work on any other client's accounts.
  - JEC concern with assignment of 1 person (Tina) to 3 roles: SAM, Implementation Manager, and Technical Support Specialist. This individual can't be 100% assigned to all three positions. This individual's resume does not support having experience as a Technical Support Specialist or Implementation Manager.
  - SAM resume is not in chronological order and is more of a biography.
- B. 4.3.12 and 4.3.13:
- Back-Up Senior Account Manager: Bidder did not provide a resume in chronological order for both proposed Back-Up SAMs and instead provided biographies.
  - Call Center Manager: Bidder did not provide a resume in chronological order for the Call Center Manager and instead provided a biography.
  - Bidder's additional Key Personnel: Local Sales and Service: Bidder did not provide a resume in chronological order and instead provided a biography.

- Bidder's additional Key Personnel: Executive Oversight: Bidder did not provide a resume in chronological order and instead provided a biography.
- C. 4.4.3 Non-Key Staff Table: Bidder left the table blank for two of the proposed non-key personnel (14 data cells in table left blank): Technical Support Specialist and Client Support Representative.
- D. 4.4.3: Non-Key Staff Table: Client Support Representative
- Bidder stated, "Dedicated Account Receivable Specialist will be assigned at contract award.". The Client Support Representative isn't an AR Specialist. The definition outlined in 4.4.2. explains "This representative must, at a minimum but not limited to, assist the SAM with eligibility questions and urgent updates, member claim questions, processing of prescription safety glasses requests and portal access requests."
- E. 4.4.5: Bidder indicated 510 customer service representatives in this section and 560 representatives in Section 1.5.1 which made the count unclear. No points deducted.
- F. 4.4.9: 3rd Bidder detail box: Bidder did not address if results of how staff are evaluated are shared with clients.
- G. 4.5: Organizational Chart:
- Bidder did not indicate on Organizational Chart who Yvonne Miller (VP) reports to.
  - Bidder made reference to other third parties in their proposal but did not include them on their Organizational Chart as required.
- H. 4.6: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated a start time of 9:00AM instead of required 8:00AM.
- I. 4.8: Bidder agreed to this Work Hours requirement, however in Section 4.6 Bidder indicated that Customer Service hours are not until 9:00AM; it is unclear who or if VSP staff are available beginning at 8:00AM. No points deducted.
- J. 4.9:
- Bidder did not disclose hosting provider 11:11 Systems in this Section but indicated it would be utilized for the Contract as provided in Schedule G Row 34 and Bidder's DR plan.
  - Bidder did not disclose Magnolia CMS in this Section but indicated it would be utilized for this Contract as provided in Schedule G Cells C15 and D15.
- K. 4.10:
- 2nd Box: Bidder did not address use of uniforms.
  - 3rd Box:
    - Bidder must identify the company that will perform background checks.
    - Bidder's response made reference to international employees, which was then unclear as to whether the Contractor would only utilize U.S. based employees. No points deducted.

**3. Schedule A, Section 5. Project Management, Section 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements**

**7/9**

- A. 5.6.1:
- Bidder did not clearly label items 1 through 11 as instructed and appears to be missing 4 through 11.
  - Bidder listed the wrong date (2016 rather than 2026) as the Contract effective date.
  - Bidder did not address transition from current contractor.
  - Bidder did not reference activating dedicated phone number, escalations, final disruption analysis, etc.
- B. 5.9.8.1.5: Bidder agreed here but indicated they are not able to provide SOC 1 Type 2 reports as required in Section 1.9.1, which makes this agreement unclear. No points deducted.

**4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4 (includes Schedule H GeoAccess) (EXCLUDING 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis)**

**4/10**

- A. 1.4.3. Bidder did not agree to this requirement and referenced their nationwide standards.
- B. 1.4.4: Bidder's GeoAccess Report in Schedule H illustrates a lower percentage in Retail locations (for Urban - 77.0%; Rural - 86.2%) as well as Ophthalmologists (for – Rural - 77%); these are the key areas where Bidder does not have adequate access. 1.4.5:
- Bidder did not agree to this requirement and appears to oppose the timing, offering dollars at risk on alternate timing.
  - Bidder did not provide their plan for improving provider access in any areas where the access standard is not met.
- C. 1.4.9: Bidder did not address ensuring the accurate administration of the State Vision Plan by their network providers.

**5. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis (includes Schedule M Vision Disruption Analysis)**

**4/13**

- A. 1.4.11: Disruption Analysis and Schedule L:
- Bidder did not agree to this requirement.
  - Bidder's Disruption Analysis indicated nearly a quarter of the Active member population would experience a disruption (23.8%) and exceeds the 20% threshold outlined in the requirement; a moderate disruption would occur for the Retiree population (15.3%). Additionally, a quarter of both the Active and Retiree population's providers would experience a disruption.

**6. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 5 Prior Experience**

**12/12**

- A. 5.1 Experience 1: Dollar value for full contract term: It was unclear if the \$60 million is for 1/1/86 to 12/31/2029 or if it was annual. If dollar amount indicated represents the total value for the entire contract term listed, this equates to a significantly smaller amount than the value of the State Vision Plan contract. No points deducted.
- B. 5.2 Experience 2: Dollar value for full contract term: It was unclear if the \$70 million was for 1/1/99 to present or if it was annual. If dollar amount indicated represents the total value for the entire contract term listed, this equates to a significantly smaller amount than the value of the State Vision Plan contract. No points deducted.
- C. 5.3 Experience 3: Dollar value for full contract term: It was unclear if the \$13.5 million was for 1/1/14 to present or if it was annual. If dollar amount indicated represents the total value for the entire contract term listed, this equates to a significantly smaller amount than the value of the State Vision Plan contract. No points deducted.

**Total Score: 57 /100**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

	<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>BCBSM</b>	<b>EyeMed</b>	<b>Heritage Vision</b>	<b>VSP</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Schedule A (EXCLUDING Sections: 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements, Sections 1.4.) 46 Points</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Schedule A, Section 4. Staffing 10 Points</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Schedule A, Section 5. Project Management, Section 7. Financial Administration and Pricing Requirements 9 Points</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>

	<b>1.4 (includes Schedule H GeoAccess) (EXCLUDING 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis) 10 Points</b>				
<b>5</b>	<b>Schedule A, Statement of Work, Network Requirements Section 1.4.11. Disruption Analysis (includes Schedule M Vision Disruption Analysis) 13 Points</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 5 Prior Experience 12 Points</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>57</b>

**V. Pricing Summary**

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

				<b>EyeMed</b>	
<b>Self-Funded Pricing</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Contract Estimate(1)</b>	<b>Months</b>	<b>Rate (Per Contract Per Month Administration Fee)</b>	<b>Total</b>
	Plan Year 1 - FY27	101,760	12	\$ 0.10	\$ 122,112.00
	Plan Year 2 - FY28	101,760	12	\$ 0.10	\$ 122,112.00
	Plan Year 3 - FY29	101,760	12	\$ 0.10	\$ 122,112.00
<b>3-Year Administrative Fee Estimated Total</b>					<b>\$ 366,336.00</b>
<b>3-Year Claims Estimate(2)</b>					<b>\$34,076,100.42</b>
<b>Estimated Total System Cost (3)</b>					<b>\$34,442,436.42</b>
<b>Quick Payment Terms</b>					<b>None</b>
<b>Implementation Credit: Per Schedule A, Section 7.4, the Contractor must provide Plan Sponsor with a competitive implementation credit or allowance. Plan Sponsor must be able to utilize the credit to offset any expenses related to implementation, including consulting fees, as deemed appropriate by Plan Sponsor. Credits must not expire during the Contract term.</b>					<b>\$65,000.00</b>
<b>Notes:</b>					
(1) The State of Michigan does not guarantee a minimum or maximum volume of services, claims and conversions.					
(2) For purposes of proposal comparison, estimates in the table above and Schedule M Claims Repricing were utilized. Bidders were to provide estimated claims cost by taking the average of their data entered for "Total Claims Amount" from CY23 & CY24.					
(3) Estimated Total System Cost will be rounded up to include an estimated 4% annual cumulative trend factor on the 3-Year Claims Estimate in this table.					

## VI. Negotiations

Clarifications and pricing reductions were requested and negotiated with the Bidder who passed the technical evaluation. The reduced administrative fee is reflected in the table above which resulted in an estimated 3-year savings of \$36,633.60 from the Bidder’s initial proposal.

## 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.

EyeMed Vision Care, LLC provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include having high agreement to the Statement of Work requirements, full agreement to the State’s Hybrid Contract Terms, Schedule E Data Security requirements, and Exhibit 2 to Schedule E HIPAA BAA requirements without exception, having the best GeoAccess results for members in every provider and retail category, having extremely low disruption, and continued vision insurance administration experience with the State of Michigan.

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 EyeMed Vision Care, LLC in the amount of \$37,500,000.00.