

---

**CERTIFIED PEER COUNSELING TRAINING**

**RFP No. 2023HCA4**

**Amendment No. 6**

---

**Date Issued:** 5/18/2023

**To:** RFP Bidders

**From:** Holly Jones, RFP Coordinator

**Purpose:** Modify Exhibit C, Written Proposal and Exhibit D, Cost Proposal

This Amendment hereby modifies Exhibit C, Written Proposal to be scored on a weighted basis, and to revise Exhibit D, Cost Proposal to be scored on pass/fail basis.

**Please Note:** Bidders are not required to use the amended Exhibit C, Written Proposal, and Exhibit D, Cost Proposal forms provided in this Amendment 6. All other terms, conditions, and specifications remain unchanged.

---

The sections in the RFP have been amended as follows:

1. RFP 2023HCA4, Section 3.3 MANDATORY AND SCORED PROPOSAL FORMS, sub subsection 3.2.10, Exhibit D - Cost Proposal (SCORED up to 10 points), is amended from scored up to 10 points, to be mandatory pass/fail, to read as follows:

**3.2.10 Exhibit D - Cost Proposal – (MANDATORY pass/fail)**

The cost evaluation process is designed to award this solicitation not necessarily to the Bidder of least cost, but rather to the Bidder whose proposal best meets the requirements of this RFP. However, Bidders are encouraged to submit proposals which are consistent with state government efforts to conserve state resources.

2. RFP 2023HCA4, Section 4.1, EVALUATION PROCEDURE, subsection 4.1.5 is amended from the evaluation team assigning points to the Cost Proposal, to be the RFP Coordinator to evaluate the Cost Proposal on a pass/fail basis, to read as follows:

**4.1.5** Responsive Written Proposals will be reviewed and scored by an evaluation team assigning points described in Section 4.2 (EVALUATION AND SCORING). Written

Proposals will be evaluated strictly in accordance with the requirements set forth in this RFP and any amendments issued. The cost is unscored but is mandatory as part of the RFP to be considered complete. The Cost will be evaluated by the RFP Coordinator on a pass/fail basis for adherence of allowable costs and adequate detail for the proposed use of funding.

- RFP 2023HCA4, Section 4.2. EVALUATION SCORING, amends the “Evaluation Table - and Maximum Points to pass/fail, to read as follows:

**4.2 EVALUATION SCORING**

Bidders’ final scores will be based on the following scored items: Executive Order 18-03, Written Proposal, and Cost Proposal to be *pass/fail*.

<b>Evaluation Table - Scored and Pass/Fail Items</b>		
<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>
Exhibit A, <i>Section E</i>	Executive Order 18-03	5
Exhibit C	Written Proposal	45
Exhibit D	Cost Proposal	Pass/fail
<b>Total Maximum Points</b>		<b>50</b>

- RFP 2023HCA4, Section 4.2. EVALUATION SCORING, subsection 4.2.2, Exhibit C, Written Proposal (Up to 45 Points), amends the evaluation table scores to be weighted, amends the maximum points scores for questions 2 - 8 to be 5 points each, and in adds a new sub subsection 4.2.2.1, to demonstrate the scoring procedure for Exhibit C, Written Proposal, to read as follows:

**4.2.2 Exhibit C, Written Proposal (Up to 45 points)**

Each question in Exhibit C, Written Proposal has been assigned weighted points using the Scoring Rubric table in section 4.2.4 below.

<b>Exhibit C, Written Proposal Evaluation Table</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Section Title</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>
1.	Project Approach/Methodology	10
2.	Deliverables	5
3.	Work Plan	5
4.	Project Schedule	5
5.	Project Management	5
6.	Bidder Experience	5
7.	Outcomes and Performance Management	5
8.	Risks	5
<b>Written Proposal Maximum Points</b>		<b>45</b>

#### 4.2.2.1 Scoring of Exhibit C – Written Proposal

Each question in *Exhibit C - Written Proposal* has been assigned a weight indicated in the Evaluation Table below. Scores assigned by evaluators based on the Scoring Rubric in 4.2.4 (sections are averaged and then multiplied by the weights in the Evaluation Table below to result in a Bidder’s total weighted score.) Any point calculations that result in decimal points will be rounded to the nearest whole number. The maximum points for each question are as outlined at the beginning of each question.

<b>Exhibit C, Written Proposal - Weighted Evaluation Table</b>			
<b>Exhibit C- Written Proposal</b>	<b>Scoring Rubric Points (1-5)</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>
Question 1	1-5	2	<b>0-10</b>
Question(s) 2-8	1-5	1	<b>0-35</b>
<b>Written Proposal Max Points Possible</b>			<b>45</b>

5. RFP 2023HCA4, Section 4.2. EVALUATION SCORING, subsection 4.2.4, Scoring Rubric for Written Response, amends the Scoring Rubric Table from (0-10) to be (0-5), to read as follows:

#### 4.2.4 Scoring Rubric for Written Response

Evaluators will score the sections outlined in the Evaluation Table above using the following (0-5) scoring rubric:

<b>Scoring Rubric</b>		
<b>Score</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>
5	Far Exceeds Requirements	The Bidder has provided an innovative, detailed, and thorough response to the requirement, and clearly demonstrates a high level of experience with, or understanding of the requirement.
4	Exceeds Requirements	The Bidder has demonstrated an above-average capability, approach, or solution and has provided a complete description of the capability, approach, or solution.
3	Meets Requirements	The Bidder has an acceptable capability of solution to meet this criterion and has described its approach in sufficient detail to be considered “as substantially meeting the requirements”.
2	Below Requirements	The Bidder has established some capability to perform the requirement but descriptions regarding their approach are not sufficient to

		demonstrate the Bidder will be fully able to meet the requirements.
1	Substantially Below Requirements	The Bidder has not established the capability to perform the requirement, has marginally described its approach, or has simply restated the requirement.
0	No Value	The Bidder does not address any component of the requirement, or no information was provided.

6. Exhibit C, Written Proposal, is amended to reflect the revised scores for sections 2-8, attached herein.
7. Exhibit D, Cost Proposal, is amended to be scored as “Mandatory - pass/fail”, attached herein.

## EXHIBIT C – WRITTEN PROPOSAL

**Maximum Points for Written Proposal: 45**

### 1. Project Approach/Methodology *(Maximum available points: 10)*

1.1 The Bidder must enter the number of total trainings for each CPC Training that they have the capacity to do for the following:

- Table 1 - (In Person) Projected CPC Training
- Table 1 - (Virtual) Projected CPC Training

<b>Table 1: Projected CPC Training (In Person)</b>		
CPC TRAININGS	Estimated Cost Per Training	Bidder to enter the number of total trainings they have the capacity for:
Crisis Awareness and Communication in Peer Support	\$20,000	
Regional	\$25,000	
Statewide	\$40,000	
Bridge	\$15,000	
<b>Table 2: Projected Train the Trainer Events</b>		
TRAIN THE TRAINER	Estimated Cost Per Training	Total Trainings
Statewide <i>(two (2) day)</i>	\$25,000	2
Regional <i>(two (2) day)</i>	\$13,500	2
<b>Table 1: Projected CPC Trainings (Virtual)</b>		
CPC TRAININGS	Estimated Cost Per Training	Bidder to enter the number of total trainings they have the capacity for:
Regional	\$15,000	
Bridge	\$10,000	

1.2 Include a complete description of the Bidder’s proposed approach to provide the number of trainings and type of trainings in the table below as well as the methodology for the project. This section should convey Bidder’s understanding of the proposed project.

**2. Deliverables** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

Fully describe deliverables to be submitted under the proposed contract. Deliverables must support the requirements set forth in Section 1.5, Scope of Work. HCA reserves the right to utilize process measures to evaluate that all deliverables are met.

**3. Work Plan** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

Include all project requirements and the proposed tasks, services, activities, etc. necessary to accomplish the scope of the project defined in this RFP. Describe the plan to utilize the HCA approved curriculum at <https://www.hca.wa.gov/billers-providers-partners/program-information-providers/peer-support>, training lists, and coordination with HCA Peer Support staff on training lists, approved applications, approved trainers, and others as appropriate.

In addition, describe the plan to coordinate the three (3) Train the Trainer events utilizing HCA approved trainers and trainers in the mentoring of the program. These trainings will focus on core competencies and facilitation of the curriculum, including SUD. This section must contain sufficient detail to convey to members of the evaluation team the Bidder’s knowledge of the subjects and skills necessary to successfully complete the project. Include any required involvement of the HCA Peer Support staff. The Bidder may also present any creative approaches that might be appropriate and may provide any pertinent supporting documentation.

**4. Project Schedule** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

Include a Project Schedule for the type of training, location of the training event indicating when the elements of the work will be completed. Project Schedule must ensure that any deliverables requested are met. The training type and location may be adjusted by the HCA Peer Support staff according to regional demand.

**5. Project Management** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

**5.1 Project Team Structure/Internal Controls** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

Provide a description of the proposed project team structure and internal controls to be used during the course of the project, including any subcontractors. Provide an organizational chart of your firm indicating lines of authority for personnel involved in performance of this potential contract and relationships of this staff to other programs or functions of the firm.

This chart must also show lines of authority to the next senior level of management. Include who within the firm will have prime responsibility and final authority for the work.

## **5.2 Staff Qualifications/Experience** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

Identify staff, including subcontractors, who will be assigned to the potential contract(s), indicating the responsibilities and qualifications of such personnel, and include the amount of time each will be assigned to the project. Provide resumes for the named staff, which include information on the individual's particular skills related to this project, education, experience, significant accomplishments and any other pertinent information. The Bidder must commit that staff identified in its proposal will actually perform the assigned work. Any staff substitution must have the prior approval of HCA Peer Support staff.

## **6. Bidder Experience** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

6.1 Indicate the experience the Bidder and any subcontractors have in the following areas associated with:

6.1.1 Administration and coordinating training events.

6.1.2 Identifying and contracting with approved trainers who are experts in the curriculum they will be training on; and

6.1.3 Coordinating with the HCA Contractor.

6.1.4 Administration and coordinating training events.

6.1.5 Identifying and contracting with approved trainers who are experts in the curriculum they will be training on; and

6.1.6 Coordinating with the HCA Contractor.

6.2 Indicate other relevant experience that indicates the qualifications of the Bidder, and any subcontractors, for the performance of the potential Contract(s).

6.3 Include a list of contracts the Bidder has had during the last five (5) years with HCA that relate to the Bidder's ability to perform the services needed under this RFP. List contract reference numbers, contract period of performance, contact persons, telephone numbers, and fax numbers/e-mail addresses.

## **7. Outcomes and Performance Measurement** *(Maximum available points: 5)*

Describe the impacts/outcomes the Bidder proposes to achieve as a result of the delivery of these services including how these outcomes would be monitored, measured, and reported to HCA.

**8. Risks** (*Maximum available points: 5*)

The Bidder must identify potential risks that are considered significant to the success of the project. Include how the Bidder would propose to effectively monitor and manage these risks, including reporting risks to the HCA Contract Manager.



## **EXHIBIT D – COST PROPOSAL**

### ***Maximum Cost Proposal Pass/Fail***

#### 1. Identification of Costs

- 1.1 Identify all costs in U.S. dollars including expenses to be charged for performing the services necessary to accomplish the objectives of the contract. The Bidder is to submit a fully detailed budget including staff costs, estimates for any applicable sales and use taxes (see below), and any expenses necessary to accomplish the tasks and to produce the deliverables under the contract. Costs for subcontractors are to be broken out separately. Please note if any subcontractors are certified by the Office of Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises.
- 1.2 Bidders must identify any expenses to which Washington State sales and use taxes apply in the Cost Proposal and include an estimated amount for such taxes (based on the current tax rate(s)). ASB(s) will be required to collect Washington state sales and use taxes from HCA, as applicable, and for remittance of payment to the Washington State Department of Revenue (DOR). HCA understands these amounts may fluctuate as tax rates fluctuate. If a tax isn’t specifically identified, HCA will assume it is included in the costs identified.
- 1.3 The cost is unscored but is mandatory as part of the RFP to be considered complete. The Cost will be evaluated by the RFP Coordinator on a pass/fail basis for adherence of allowable costs and adequate detail for the proposed use of funding.