

Sole Source CONTRACT Filing Justification Template

Use the following justification template for preparing to file sole source contracts in the [Sole Source Contracts Database](#) (SSCD). Once completed, copy and paste the answers into the corresponding SSCD question and answer fields. You will also need to include a copy of this completed form in the documents you post to your agency website and in [WEBS](#).

What is a sole source contract?

"Sole source" means a contractor providing goods or services of such a unique nature or sole availability at the location required that the contractor is clearly and justifiably the only practicable source to provide the goods or services. (RCW 39.26.010)

Unique qualifications or services are those which are highly specialized or one-of-a-kind.

Other factors which may be considered include past performance, cost-effectiveness (learning curve), and/or follow-up nature of the required goods and/or services. Past performance alone does not provide adequate justification for a sole source contract. Time constraints may be considered as a contributing factor in a sole source justification however will not be on its own a sufficient justification.

Why is a sole source justification required?

The State of Washington, by policy and law, believes competition is the best strategy to obtain the best value for the goods and services it purchases, and to ensure that all interested vendors have a fair and transparent opportunity to sell goods and services to the state.

A sole source contract does not benefit from competition. Thus the state, through RCW 39.26.010, has determined it is important to evaluate whether the conditions, costs and risks related to the proposal of a sole source contract truly outweigh forgoing the benefits of a competitive contract.

Providing compelling answers to the following questions will facilitate the evaluation.

Specific Problem or Need

Washington state is implementing child, youth, and family crisis teams as a result of HB1477. Washington state has chosen a specific evidence-based model and is working to incrementally build system capacity and infrastructure to support this model. We applied to participate in the national learning collaborative that offers state specific technical assistance and coaching, and state to state learning opportunities with states at various levels of implementation of this model. Washington was chosen to be one of eight participants in the Quality Learning Collaborative (QLC).

Sole Source Criteria

The Institute for Innovation and Implementation has partnered with Child Health and Development Institute (CHDI), Social Current, and the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors (NASMHPD) to launch the Mobile Response and Stabilization Services (MRSS) Quality Learning Collaborative (QLC). The two-year MRSS QLC, led by subject matter experts with direct experience in designing and installing MRSS in Connecticut, New Jersey, and Oklahoma, focuses on the structural changes necessary to fully implement MRSS including engaging leadership, finance, policy, and workforce, and includes: best-practice presentations featuring examples from the field and lessons learned; intensive small group (maximum of 8 states/sites) facilitated peer-to-peer learning; individual monthly coaching; data collection and analysis; affinity group opportunities; and access to resources and tools to support design and implementation.

Washington state applied and was chosen to participate in this learning collaborative, which results in a sole source contract. Through a Transformation Transfer Initiative grant, the national partners have become acquainted with the state's current mobile crisis status in relations to children, youth, and family teams, teams serving tribal communities, and the overarching structure, which uniquely positions them for this work.

By June 2023, Washington's Mobile Response and Stabilization Services (MRSS) model will benefit from the below:

1. Twelve (12) individual virtual coaching meetings
2. Ten (10) focused and interactive MRSS QLC peer-to-peer learning opportunities to operationalize MRSS design and implementation through peer learning
3. Six (6) webinars for stakeholders (e.g., family and youth organizations, judges, child welfare, schools, providers, pediatricians/psychiatrists)
4. Subject Matter Expert consults, including family/youth engagement and leadership and diversity, equity and inclusion, as needed
5. Provision of and coaching support on the below tools (with expected products indicated):
 - MRSS Care Pathways – guidance and coaching in development of MRSS Care Pathway(s) specific to Washington State
 - MRSS System Readiness Tool (SRT) – tool scored by MRSS faculty in partnership with Washington State to identify, prioritize, and receive technical assistance and coaching to address SRT indicators* under the below categories, aligned with Implementation Science:
 - Need – problem identified
 - Need – Care pathway designed
 - Fit – Defined population
 - Fit – Confirmed model/intervention
 - Outcomes – Established family/youth outcomes
 - Outcomes – Model fidelity and quality expectations
 - Outer Setting – Vision
 - Outer Setting – Financing
 - Outer Setting – Leadership team
 - Outer Setting – Written plan intake/referral process including screening and assessment

- Outer Setting – Established care/practice standards
- Outer Setting – Data collection/continuous quality improvement (CQI)
- Inner Setting – Training/workforce development
- Inner Setting – Staffing/oversight
- Inner Setting – Provider needs and qualifications
- Inner Setting – Feedback loops/data dissemination (Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycles)
- Inner Setting – Marketing
- Inner Setting – Policy review and identification of needed changes
- Inner Setting – RFP/contract language
- Inner Setting – Single plan of care
- Inner Setting – Review/monitoring
- Best Practice Standards of Care – a comprehensive set of standards to be adopted and customized, as needed, for use as Washington’s MRSS Practice Standards
- Practice Change Framework – a tool to monitor (and identify coaching needs) for alignment with MRSS Best Practice Standards of Care
- Data Elements – core set of MRSS data elements, agreed upon by the MRSS QLC sites, to be collected, analyzed, and shared (aggregate data) across the QLC to inform MRSS design and implementation via CQI and PDCA**
- Environmental Scan – use of and coaching to support implementation of a Payor and Provider Scans, designed to assess the current scope and reach of children’s crisis services in Washington and evaluate the extent to which existing services adhere to the best practice MRSS model, are sustainable, and can meet expected capacities

*Year 2 training, coaching, and peer learning will continue to focus on indicators that were not fully met in Year 1.

**Cross-QLC data collection, analyses, and sharing will continue as part of CQI and PDCA in Year 2

- What kind of market research did the agency conduct to conclude that alternative sources were inappropriate or unavailable? Provide a narrative description of the agency’s due diligence in determining the basis for the sole source contract, including methods used by the agency to conduct a review of available sources such as researching trade publications, industry newsletters and the internet; contacting similar service providers; and reviewing statewide pricing trends and/or agreements. Include a list of businesses contacted (if you state that no other businesses were contacted, explain why not), date of contact, method of contact (telephone, mail, e-mail, other), and documentation demonstrating an explanation of why those businesses could not or would not, under any circumstances, perform the contract; or an explanation of why the agency has determined that no businesses other than the prospective contractor can perform the contract.

The agency conducted an internet search of those offering technical assistance and peer to peer support for the implementation of Mobile Response and Stabilization Services. All named national technical assistance is associated with the collective participants in the QLC.

Washington state applied for a spot in the QLC based on research on MRSS as the best practice recommendation for children, youth, and family crisis intervention. These recommendations come from the [Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Association](#).

- What considerations were given to providing opportunities in this contract for small business, including but not limited to unbundling the goods and/or services acquired. This contract is for national technical assistance. The coordinating entity has brought together the network of experts nationally and coordinated the technical assistance, coaching, and peer support efforts.
- Provide a detailed and compelling description that includes quantification of the costs and risks mitigated by contracting with this contractor (i.e. learning curve, follow-up nature).

The QLC is tailored to the specific needs of the state. States provide an overview of the current state of children, youth, and family mobile crisis in the state and resources and coaching is tailored to the stage of implementation, ensuring that states do not fall behind the learning curve.

Washington's state is purchasing the time and expertise on national consultants and by June 2023, Washington's Mobile Response and Stabilization Services (MRSS) model will benefit from the below:

1. Twelve (12) individual virtual coaching meetings
2. Ten (10) focused and interactive MRSS QLC peer-to-peer learning opportunities to operationalize MRSS design and implementation through peer learning
3. Six (6) webinars for stakeholders (e.g., family and youth organizations, judges, child welfare, schools, providers, pediatricians/psychiatrists)
4. Subject Matter Expert consults, including family/youth engagement and leadership and diversity, equity and inclusion, as needed
5. Provision of and coaching support on the below tools (with expected products indicated):
 - MRSS Care Pathways – guidance and coaching in development of MRSS Care Pathway(s) specific to Washington State
 - MRSS System Readiness Tool (SRT) – tool scored by MRSS faculty in partnership with Washington State to identify, prioritize, and receive technical assistance and coaching to address SRT indicators* under the below categories, aligned with Implementation Science:
 - Need – problem identified
 - Need – Care pathway designed
 - Fit – Defined population
 - Fit – Confirmed model/intervention
 - Outcomes – Established family/youth outcomes
 - Outcomes – Model fidelity and quality expectations
 - Outer Setting – Vision
 - Outer Setting – Financing
 - Outer Setting – Leadership team

- Outer Setting – Written plan intake/referral process including screening and assessment
- Outer Setting – Established care/practice standards
- Outer Setting – Data collection/continuous quality improvement (CQI)
- Inner Setting – Training/workforce development
- Inner Setting – Staffing/oversight
- Inner Setting – Provider needs and qualifications
- Inner Setting – Feedback loops/data dissemination (Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycles)
- Inner Setting – Marketing
- Inner Setting – Policy review and identification of needed changes
- Inner Setting – RFP/contract language
- Inner Setting – Single plan of care
- Inner Setting – Review/monitoring
- Best Practice Standards of Care – a comprehensive set of standards to be adopted and customized, as needed, for use as Washington’s MRSS Practice Standards
- Practice Change Framework – a tool to monitor (and identify coaching needs) for alignment with MRSS Best Practice Standards of Care
- Data Elements – core set of MRSS data elements, agreed upon by the MRSS QLC sites, to be collected, analyzed, and shared (aggregate data) across the QLC to inform MRSS design and implementation via CQI and PDCA**
- Environmental Scan – use of and coaching to support implementation of a Payor and Provider Scans, designed to assess the current scope and reach of children’s crisis services in Washington and evaluate the extent to which existing services adhere to the best practice MRSS model, are sustainable, and can meet expected capacities

*Year 2 training, coaching, and peer learning will continue to focus on indicators that were not fully met in Year 1.

- Is the agency proposing this sole source contract because of special circumstances such as confidential investigations, copyright restrictions, etc.? If so, please describe.

Special circumstance is that the agency competed for a spot in the QLC and was chosen to be one of the 8 participants. Through a Transformation Transfer Initiative grant, the national partners have become acquainted with the state’s current mobile crisis status in relations to children, youth, and family teams, teams serving tribal communities, and the overarching structure, which uniquely positions them for this work.

- Is the agency proposing this sole source contract because of unavoidable, critical time delays or issues that prevented the agency from completing this acquisition using a competitive process? If so, please describe. For example, if time constraints are applicable, identify when the agency was on notice of the need for the goods and/or service, the entity that imposed the constraints, explain the authority of that entity to impose them, and provide the timelines within which work must be accomplished.

The Quality Learning Collaborative (QLC) has begun. The familiarity with the state allows us time to move through this process, though time remains critical factor for establishing a contract based on where the QLC is in process.

- Is the agency proposing this sole source contract because of a geographic limitation? If the proposed contractor is the only source available in the geographical area, state the basis for this conclusion and the rationale for limiting the size of the geographical area selected.

There is no geographical constraints as the project provides access to 8 states across the country. The implementation TA requires specialized knowledge gained from working with states of varying geographies across the country.

- What are the consequences of not having this sole source filing approved? Describe in detail the impact to the agency and to services it provides if this sole source filing is not approved.

If the sole source is not approved the agency will be implementing a model without support, lessons learned, and tailored coaching from national experts with decades of experience developing and implementing the model. This will result in the need to adjust contract language, data requirements, and community expectations after establishing mobile response teams in order to adjust them towards the model rather than building them with the appropriate direction and a cross- agency, multidisciplinary state team at the table.

Sole Source Posting

- Provide the date in which the sole source posting, the draft contract, and a copy of the Sole Source Contract Justification Template were published in WEBS.

October 27, 2022. HCA has not yet received responses from the sole source posting in WEBS.

Reasonableness of Cost

Since competition was not used as the means for procurement, how did the agency conclude that the costs, fees, or rates negotiated are fair and reasonable? Please make a comparison with comparable contracts, use the results of a market survey, or employ some other appropriate means calculated to make such a determination.

Costs for this program were based on fees associated with national technical assistance and existing bodies of consultation. Trainers and coaches are the leaders of these efforts nationally.