

I want to apologize for the confusion our presentation caused on Tuesday. In trying to explain why only three (3) vendors were selected for interview, a member of my team mistakenly referred to a section of the RFP that prohibited opening pricing for vendors scoring less than 300 points on the technical proposal instead of the provision providing that only the top three (3) technical proposals would be interviewed. This RFP contained both provisions, which resulted in the Department only considering technical proposals when determining which vendors with which to conduct oral interviews. While we understand that it may have caused some confusion, we did not receive any questions related to the provision nor did we have any protests filed by vendors.

The language in this RFP mirrored the language from the 2022 solicitation. As with that solicitation, we only considered the technical scores when determining which vendors to advance to interviews, and as in 2022, only the top three (3) technical scores were interviewed.

I believe we did a poor job of explaining how pricing was considered during the evaluation process. I always strive to follow the letter and spirit of the law, and I pride myself on maintaining open lines of communication with members of this body. This RFP has been pending in some form or fashion for almost two years now, and while I have received many questions about other parts of the process, earlier this week was the first time concerns have ever been voiced about the way it was being scored. I was taken by surprise, and I apologize to you all for not being clearer in our response to your questions. I would like to take this opportunity to remedy that now.

While we may have left the impression that cost was not considered, it was absolutely considered during the evaluation process. We received proposals from five (5) vendors. As stated in the RFP, only the top three (3) vendors after technical proposals were scored progressed to oral presentations. After those three (3) completed oral presentations, the cost proposals of the top three (3) were considered. After using the scoring methodology outlined in the RFP, which was word for word the same as the RFP in 2022, the top three (3) were: Wellpath, VitalCore, and Centurion.

Contractor Name	Tech. Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Wellpath	459.99	300	759.99
VitalCore	459.64	242.46	702.1
Centurion	474.83	215.46	690.29

In the interest of full disclosure and for the benefit of this body, since Tuesday we have rescored all five (5) vendors using their technical proposal scores and their cost proposals. Once again, the top three (3) were in order: Wellpath, VitalCore, and Centurion. Keep in mind, since two (2) of the vendors did not progress to oral presentations, the scoring only included the technical proposal and price. Nevertheless, the results did not change. Additionally, it should be noted that Wexford, one (1) of the vendors who did not make the top three, did not submit a bid that was lower than the successful vendor. Over the possible ten-year term of the agreement, Wexford's bid was over \$430 million higher than the successful vendor.

Contractor Name	Tech. Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Wellpath	484.31	300.00	784.31
VitalCore	477.09	227.35	704.44
Centurion	456.43	215.46	671.89
YesCare	434.35	226.98	661.33
Wexford	422.90	234.72	657.62

I sincerely apologize for the mistakes that were made during our presentation on Tuesday, and I hope this addresses your concerns.