



Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: 8/5/2022

To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management *Mark Hempel*
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPB, CPPO, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-70333, Administrative Code Assessment

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-70333, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Milliman, Inc. be selected to begin contract negotiations to perform the Administrative Code Assessment for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA).

Milliman, Inc. has committed to subcontract 4.94% of the contract value to **Mangas Global Solutions, Inc.** (which is certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 11.29% of the contract value to **Lawrance Policy Consulting, LLC** (which is certified Women-owned Business (WBE)) and 18.34% of the contract value to **Axon Advisors, LLC** (which is certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated two year and four-month Contract Value: \$637,490.28

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Health Management Associates, Inc.
2. Milliman, Inc.

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

Criteria	Points
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
4. Buy Indiana	5
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
7. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)

Total: 100 (103 if bonus awarded)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in Section 3.2 (“Evaluation Criteria”) of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. All of the Respondents were deemed responsive as they met the mandatory requirements listed in the RFP.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

The two (2) responsive Respondents’ proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal (5 Points)

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the information the Respondent provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Information
- References

Technical Proposal (45 Points)

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent’s proposal in the following areas:

- Overview of Project and Proposed Team (Scope of Work Section 1, 2, 3, and 4)
- Contractor Experience (Scope of Work Section 5)
- Assessment Execution and Report (Scope of Work Section 6)
- Recommendations Execution and Report (Scope of Work Section 6)
- Promulgation Assistance (Scope of Work Section 7)
- Project Management (Scope of Work Section 8)

The evaluation team’s initial scoring is based on a review of the Respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ) Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	37.50
Milliman, Inc.	37.50

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

Price points were awarded on the Respondents’ Costs as follows:

Score =

- If Respondent’s Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.
- If Respondent’s Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost amount})}$$

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents’ cost proposals is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	23.27
Milliman, Inc.	30.00

The combined MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Combined Initial MAQ and Cost Scores

Respondent	Combined Score 80 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	60.77
Milliman, Inc.	67.50

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to invite both Respondents to give an oral presentation based on initial Total Scores. Additionally, the evaluation team issued a request for a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) from both Respondents.

D. Post Oral Presentations

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the oral presentations. The scores for all Respondents after the oral presentations were as follows:

Table 4: Post-Oral Presentations MAQ Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	37.50
Milliman, Inc.	37.50

E. BAFO Evaluations and IDOA Scoring

The Respondents' cost scores were updated based on their BAFOs. IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana, MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarifies certain M/WBE and IVOSB information with Respondents. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pts.)
Health Management Associates, Inc.	37.50	30.00	0.00	-1.00	4.05	5.00	75.55
Milliman, Inc.	37.50	28.73	0.00	3.13	5.00	6.00	80.35

* See Section 3.2.5/6/7 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE and IVOSB bonus points.

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed solutions' ability to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of two (2) years and four (4) months from the date of contract execution. The contract shall terminate on December 31, 2024.

Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPB, CPPO, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration