EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

YH22-0055 Transitional Shelter Bridge Housing Services at Bower Park

TO: Meggan LaPorte, CPPO, MSW
Chief Procurement Officer

FROM: Toni Cota
Senior Procurement Specialist

Date: March 31, 2021

The Request for Proposals (RFP) commenced in accordance with A.R.S. § 36-2906.

Timeline

1. Procurement Disclosure Statements were signed by individuals involved in the solicitation in accordance with applicable rules and regulations.
2. The RFP was published on the AHCCCS website on Friday, November 12, 2021.
3. The RFP was advertised in the Record Reporter on Friday, November 19, 2021
4. Vendor questions were due by Monday, November 22, 2021.
5. Solicitation amendment one (1) included answers to Offerors' questions which was published on the AHCCCS website on December 1, 2021. The solicitation amendment also allowed Offerors a second round of questions due by December 9, 2021 by 5:00pm Arizona time.
6. Solicitation amendment two (2) included answers to the second round of Offerors' questions which was published on the AHCCCS website on Friday, December 17, 2021.
7. The deadline for requesting access to the SFTP server was Tuesday, December 28, 2021.
8. The RFP closed (Proposals Due) on Wednesday, January 5, 2022.
9. Two Offerors submitted their "Offeror's Intent to Bid' forms; however, only one proposal was received.
10. Evaluation meetings were held on Thursday, January 27, 2022 and Friday, January 28, 2022.
11. A Clarification from the Offeror was requested on Feb 1, 2022 with a due date of Tuesday, February 8, 2022 3:00 P.M. AZ time. The Offeror requested a two week extension which was approved and they were given a due date of Monday, February 21, 3:00 P.M., AZ time.
12. A Vendor Presentation/Discussion was held on March 15, 2022.
13. Award was made on April 1, 2022.

Award Recommendation

The evaluation committee recommends contract award to be made to Copa Health Inc. A history of the RFP development process and proposal evaluation process is provided below.

History of RFP Development and Release

The development of the RFP took place during the timeframe of September 13, 2021 – October 13, 2021. The RFP was published on the AHCCCS website and advertised in the Record Reporter. The proposal due date was January 5, 2022 at 3:00 PM (Arizona time).

Scoring Methodology
For the scoring methodology, an agreement was made to apply the following point scale:

1. Offeror's Method of Approach maximum points allowable of 500.
2. Offeror's Experience and Expertise of the Firm maximum points allowable of 400.
3. Cost maximum points allowable of 100.

Receipt of Proposals
One (1) proposal was received on January 5, 2021 before the 3:00 p.m. (Arizona Time) deadline utilizing the AHCCCS SFTP server in accordance with the RFP instructions.

1. Copa Health Inc.

Evaluation Process
The one (1) proposal was evaluated pursuant to the evaluation criteria published in the RPP. The proposal was uploaded to a secured/designated RFP share point site for all evaluation committee members to review. The following subject matter experts served as evaluation committee members:

- David Bridge (AHCCCS)
- Rubin Solis (AHCCCS)
- Megan Woods (AHCCCS)

Additional subject matter experts were used on an as needed basis. All evaluation committee members were required to sign a Procurement Disclosure Statement/Confidentiality Statement at the commencement of the development of the RFP.

Evaluation Meetings
The evaluation team meet on Thursday, January 27, 2022 and Friday, January 28, 2022. At this meeting the committee discussed and provided feedback for the proposal that was received.

On Feb 1, 2022, a clarification letter was electronically sent to the Offeror with a response due date of Tuesday, February 8, 2022 3:00 P.M. AZ time. The Offeror requested a two week extension which was approved. The new due date given was Monday, February 21, 3:00 P.M., AZ time.

Upon reviewing the clarification responses from the Offeror, the team requested a Vendor Presentation/Discussion which took place on Tuesday, March 15, 2022.

Conclusion
After giving the proposal serious consideration, clarification responses, and the evaluation of the criteria published in the RFP, the Committee recommended a contract award to Copa Health Inc. It is determined that this Offeror submitted a proposal that was responsible and responsive. It was further determined that this award will be the most advantageous to AHCCCS and the State of Arizona based on the evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation.

I concur with the committee's recommendation.

The final scoring summary is attached.

AHCCCS
Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System

Scoring Summary

	COPA
B1 Method of Approach	342.4
B2 Experience/Expertise	335.2
B3 Proposed Operating Budget	60
Total	**737.6**

SCALE USED FOR SCORING TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		
Score		**Description**
5	**Excellent**	The response is very extensive, detailed, clear and informative and flows in a logical and sequential manner. It not only fully answers/addresses all aspects of the question/item, but provides additional relevant information. After reading the response, the reviewer should have no (or very few) questions about the offerors plans to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.
4.5		
4	**Good**	The response is extensive, detailed, clear, and informative and flows in a logical and sequential manner. It answers/addresses the aspects of the question/item, but not quite as extensively as an ***Excellent*** response. After reading the response, the reviewer should understand the offerors plan to fulfill the requirements of the RFP and should have few, if any, questions.
3.5		
3	**Middle of the Road**	The response is clear and informative, but lacks detail and explanations. There may be some gaps in logic. It merely answers/addresses the question/items, but provides no additional information or insight into the plan. After reading the response, the reviewer should have a good overall sense of the offerors plan, but will probably have questions.
2.5		
2	**Poor**	The response lacks clarity and information. There are gaps in the logic and flow of the answer. It fails to address some aspects of the question/item. After reading the response, the reviewer is not exactly sure what the offerors plan is and has numerous questions.
1.5		
1	**Fail**	The response has numerous gaps in logic, lacks information, is hard to follow and fails to provide a clear plan for execution. It indicates that the offeror has little understanding of the question/item and/or has very poor plan of implementation. After reading the response, the reviewer has many questions.
0.5		
0	**Non-Responsive**	The offeror failed to provide a response to the question/item.

Consensus Scoresheet					
Offeror: COPA		Assigned Score (0-5)	MAX Points	WEIGHTED SCORE	**Comments**
B1 Method of Approach (Limit 30 pages)					
1. Proposed Program Model-Bridge Facility					
1	1.1 Population	4	31	24.8	Good response, good handle on Co-morbidity, BH consequences, issued clarification on the CM model and low barrier
2	1.2 Subpopulations and cultural competence	4.5	31	27.9	Good job describing substance abuse and understand the MH and physical health of the population Evalutors would like to see specific training around certain areas in cultural competency, Well written, described subpopulations and some of their capacity Great response, trauma informed care perssspective, history of indiv, harm reduction approach, recogniezed div of population
3	1.3 Specific Needs and Resources/Data	4	20	16	Good response, team would like more detail around low barrier, structural described ramping up to do with staff, step up approach, not as much detail on the shelter aspect, as the BH Question around what type of AHCCCS registered provider addressed integration, citations around sucessful interventions, invid need, specific targets and strategies Team would like to see more detail on how they will get at the data to support the intervention, relationship with HIE
4	1.4 Evidence Based Models and innovation	4	31	24.8	Impressive response, Overall strong approach to CM and wraparound svs and assessments, motivational interviewing - lacked detail (meeting clients where they are, client informed in Case Planning, motivational interviewing to develop Case Plan) Response mentioned critical time intervention (CTI) Coordinated Entry System participation - huge innovation Excellent description of trauma informed shelter cert, Single pharm provider, health coaching staff and wellness model Not mentioned: CLRS, SOAR (disability applications), linkage between the interventions
5	1.5 Daily typical experience of a participant	3	20	12	Ok Response, team had some follow up questions. Questions around Bag searches, onsite security and termination policy. Offeror provided clarification of this in policy. Questions also to transportation and translation services, that were confirmed in clarifications.
6	1.6 Basic necessities	3.5	20	14	Adequate response. Includes laundry service, comes to site, covered the basics
7	1.7 Food and meals	3.5	7	4.9	Food process described adequately, identified key partners. Team had questions around food storage and offsite food to go which were clarified by the Offeror. Would have liked to see some mention of increasing independence in finding, making and budgeting for self sufficiency, how each resident will store their own personal food or pet food and/or address food insecurity behaviors.
8	1.8 Operations and staffing	4	31	24.8	Good response. Team requested clarification on case management ratios and staffing. Policies were provided. Team had concerns about realistic ratios given workforce shortages in the market right now. COPA providing 24/7 oncall for crisis svcs- value add Clinical staffing model is effective, Strong capacity to address violence, inappropriate behavior Aggressive case management target ratio, innovative model
9	1.9 Animals	3.5	7	4.9	Adequate response and policy provided. Response went beyond service animals, mentioned emotional support animals, mentioned outside organizations that work with assistance animals, Require that animals be licensed and rabies vaccine
2. Collaboration to meet the needs of members					
10	2.1 Collaborations with SOC	4	31	24.8	Great job describing collaborations with SOC, community supports, justice system collaboration, well established Strong relationships with partners and diferent provider types Coordinated Entry - higest risk indivi - great partnership HIMS participant Comprehensive description of partnerships with Outreach teams, Phoenix Rescue Mission, and Community Bridges
11	2.2 Care coordination with health plans	4	20	16	Good Response - response did not speak to what they will do to ensure communication coordination and access to indiv who may be from outside Maricopa County. Working with all of AHCCCS MCOs, working with peers and family, addressed harm reduction, substance use. COPA has strong capacity to work with health plans, unsure if CASS has same capacity as newly applied as a registered provider.

Consensus Scoresheet					
Offeror: COPA		Assigned Score (0-5)	MAX Points	WEIGHTED SCORE	**Comments**
12	2.3 Transition Services/ Facility Design	3	50	30	Response was adequate. Proposal left some questions about details of the facility design, which were responded to in the clarifications.
3. Proposed Program Model-Licensed Clinic					
13	3.1 Licensed clinic provider	3	31	18.6	Proposal lacked details around member choice, coordination between outpatient providers offsite, workforce shortages, connection with provider after resident leaves the shelter or possibility to serve the surrounding area as a community provider. Offeror adequately clarified these topics in its clarification response.
14	3.2 Licensing and approval	3	7	4.2	Adequately met the standard.
15	3.3 Physical setting	3	31	18.6	Proposal lacked detialed information around security measures for the whole property, privacy for residents, ADA requirements, separate entry ways, storage, outdoor landscaping, and smoking. Offeror clarified these topics during clarification phase, but addition work needs to be done in updating their policies in these areas.
4. Accountablity					
16	4.1 Legal compliance	3	20	12	Adequate response.
17	4.2 Operational and Programmatic performance including outcomes and safety	3.5	31	21.7	Proposal was adequate though it lacked details in targets or benchmarks for shelter area. (members who are elig for SSI, SSDI, performance metrics). Response identified outcomes and clinical goals align with homeless system performance measures, however did not show aggregate numbers. No mention of how to treat residents coming in with injuries or wounds. Overall response was adequate.
18	4.3 Financial - (may need to be broken out) including controls, funding for startup and operational years,. other program income	3	50	30	Response was adequate. Proposal left some questions about details of the facility design, which were responded to in the clarifications.
19	4.4 stakeholder feedback	2	31	12.4	Inadequate response, lacked details on on member engagement and member/client/community and stakeholder feedback.
Total B1 Method of Approach			500	**342.4**	
B2 Experience and Expertise (Limit of 20 pages exluding attachments)					
1. General Organizational					
1	1.1 E&E in financial mgt of transition housing	4	40	32	Offeror has sound experience in financial management, COPA has advanced system and exp with BH, CASS - mid sized funding and HUD grants, high level of capacity
2	1.2 Experience securing funding	5	40	40	Demonstrated experience mgt complex grants, highly experienced in fundraising for both COPA and CASS, constantly applying for new grant funding, well connected
3	1.3 3rd party recognition	4	32	25.6	Many awards for grants, projects, No specific awards of certifications or best practice, letters of support
4	1.4 Design and development of facility - experience, recommendations, covid mitigation plans	4	32	25.6	CASS is highly experienced in running a shelter, considering design elements, impressive plans for COVID-19 modifications, however not a lot of transitional experience
5	1.5 Staff training	4	40	32	Adequate response for Clinical training, COPA has impressive experience in this area, and CASS included some trauma informed care, not much detail. Many trainings listed, EMDR,CBT, culturally sensitive trauma informed, 2 day orientation, trauma informed, other clinical training would be required in by the provider type
2. Bridge Facility E & E					
6	2.1 E&E for transitional housing	3.5	40	28	Adequate response. Limited direct experience with a transitional shelter program but have been involved in emergency shelter and SMI housing, good cross over skills and experience, permanent supportive housing (low barrier), and BH experience

Consensus Scoresheet					
Offeror: COPA		Assigned Score (0-5)	MAX Points	WEIGHTED SCORE	**Comments**
7	2.2 E&E for special populations	5	40	40	Excellent response. Offeror provides specialized CM to those with either more intensive or specialized needs, including 30% of clients who are chronically homeless, the 30% who are over age 55, veterans, youth, families, and children. Good reputation. COPA exp with individuals with difficulty maintaining housing.
8	2.3 E&E for evidence based program	4	40	32	Offeror is well established in implementing housing programs. Not a lot of expertise with transitional housing, however response included Lighthouse model, Programs for special poulations including Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Response was comprehensive with SAMSHA recovery model, critical time intervention, evidence based practices, trauma informed care and applied behavioral analysis.
3. Clinical Faclility					
9	3.1 E&E for clinical facility specific to SMI	4	32	25.6	Good Response, COPA demonstrated relevant experience and expertise in this area, good experience with members that my not do as well with other programs.
4. Corporate Structure and Governance					
10	4.1 Legal Structure	(P/F)	0	0	PASS
11	4.2 Articles of Inc.	(P/F)	0	0	PASS
12	4.3 Ownership/Governance, Org Chart	(P/F)	0	0	PASS
13	4.4 Key Staff E&E	5	32	32	Experience is good and reputable.
14	4.5 Resumes	(P/F)	0	0	Pass
15	4.6 Corp Commision good standing	(P/F)	0	0	Pass
16	4.7 History of legal issues	(P/F)	0	0	Pass
5. Proposed Subcontractors					
17	5.1 Roles of subcontractors	3.5	32	22.4	Good response and additional information included with clarification.
18	5.2 Formal agreements with subs if applicable	(P/F)	0	0	PASS
Total B2 Experience and Expertise			400	**335.2**	
B3 Proposed Operating Budget					
		3	100	**60**	Response was adequate. Proposal left some questions about details of the facility design, which were responded to in the clarifications.