



MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor
Misty Ann Giles, Director

doa.mt.gov

406.444.2460

doadirector@mt.gov

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Solicitation Title/Event Name:

Solicitation Number:

Solicitation Close Date:

Notice of Intent to Award Post Date:

Issuing Contracts Officer contact information:

The State intends to award a contract to the apparent successful offeror(s) of the above-mentioned solicitation. The Notice of Intent to Award shall not be considered a binding commitment by the state.

Under the Montana Procurement Act, the State has made the relevant scoring matrix/bid tab for the above-mentioned solicitation available for public inspection. Comments from the public regarding the proposed award must be submitted to the Contracts Officer listed above within this 7-day notice period.

Apparent Successful Offeror(s)

Unsuccessful Offeror(s)

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R
RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET								
Category	Possible Points	Healthy Interactions	Hilltop Grp Inc	Montana Health Research & Education Foundation	Palindrome Level Transport	RSM US LLP	Urgent Care Physical Therapy	Wellness Equity Alliance
Scope of Services/Provision of Services								
Implementation Approach	150	65	90	145	0	110	35	130
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	25	30	48	0	45	25	36
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	15	30	48	0	40	25	30
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	15	30	49	0	37	30	36
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	10	35	48	0	35	30	35
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	30	58	70	0	55	45	55
Change Management Plan	50	10	25	46	0	35	40	30
Incentive Program Tracking	50	10	25	45	0	30	30	30
Final Reporting	50	15	30	40	0	15	32	30
Use of Subcontractors	250	50	100	245	0	150	75	70
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	30	70	120	0	80	75	65
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	10	25	45	0	10	30	35
Population Health Interventions	100	60	60	95	0	85	62	60
Access to Preferred Rates	100	0	70	95	0	80	30	55
Partnership Development	100	10	65	90	0	80	30	55
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	0	25	48	0	29	20	25
Cost Savings Tracking	50	0	25	50	0	38	25	25
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	10	50	94	0	74	30	65
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	0	30	45	0	29	20	38
Sustainability & Scalability	50	0	30	47	0	40	25	30
Mobile Vans	50	0	30	50	0	35	25	40
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	0	60	95	0	45	35	50
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	0	80	140	0	50	75	60
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	0	65	95	0	50	35	60
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	0	25	46	0	30	25	30
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Interfacility Transport System	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Value Added Offerings	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
References /Client Reference Forms								
References	100	60	50	99	0	90	60	70
Company Profile and Experience								
Company Profile and Experience	150	75	80	150	10	10	88	75
Resumes								
Staffing & Resumes	150	70	50	150	0	80	55	75
Product Demonstrations/Interviews								
Oral Interview	1500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R
RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET								
Category	Possible Points	Healthy Interactions	Hilltop Grp Inc	Montana Health Research & Education Foundation	Palindrome Level Transport	RSM US LLP	Urgent Care Physical Therapy	Wellness Equity Alliance
Cost Proposal								
Cost Proposal	1000	0.00	0.00	1000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Equal Pay for Montana Women								
5% Bonus PointsEqual Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
TOTAL:	5000	620	1393	3388	636	1537	1162	1445

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R

RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 5000 points: The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

Offeror (Company) Name: Healthy Interactions			Total Points Awarded: 870
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Scope of Services/Provision of Services			
Implementation Approach	150	65	Did not address how flexible approach for this implementation, focused only on chronic care management. Did not address collaboration or data. Did include aims but did not include recommendations from CoE awarded vendor. Did not address CoE recommendations at all, Questions were not pertaining to CoE recommendations, No mention of how to engage with successful partnership
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	25	Did not answer the question, Did not provide a detailed PM plan or how to develop, high level and minimal information or understanding of the scope. Limited PM focused on staffing, nothing specific to tasks specific to SOW, only included staffing models and healthcare practice organizations, needed more detail, focused only on an education plan. Did not address the technical assistance or how the vendor would stay on track with milestones.
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	15	Plan provided was not relevant to sow, no data tracking specific to project and no similar past projects, did not address how missed milestones or changes to workplan, no examples of examples or successes as requested on past projects,
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	15	response focused on sustainability tied to reimbursement, but did not address risk management or compliance, or how risks will be monitored and tracked. Sustainability was only for their proposed SOW, which was not the same SOW as what was requested, only pertaining to workforce training
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	10	Did not address capacity for rural hospitals or areas requested with CoE, no details on technical assistance, or ensure rural/frontier communities would receive tailored support. Capacity building is only for rural educators, not within all areas requested, or the needs of tribes or frontier sites

Offeror (Company) Name: Healthy Interactions			Total Points Awarded: 870
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	30	training and placement of educator workforce is not consistent to what was requested, examples not provided, tools and frameworks were only consistent with educator workforce and not specific to RFP, no assessments for readiness or examples of successful implementations provided,
Change Management Plan	50	10	No formal change management provided, no past successes, not detailed to change management overall,
Incentive Program Tracking	50	10	incentives only tied to CPCE proposed work and not consistent with SOW in RFP, some details on data tracking but lacked details on how that was tied to incentive payments, monitoring or reporting, did not provide mistargets would be provided, reporting and communication regarding status of mistargets
Final Reporting	50	15	Some details on the process for development were limited, key indicators were provided but lacked an understanding of CoE expectations. The response did not provide key details in all areas of the RFP scope, mitigation of risk, surveys of experience, and items in the expected reports were not included. A different state's name was used in the response.
Use of Subcontractors	250	50	response did not include rationale for selecting subcontractors, did not address understanding of MT healthcare landscape, no approach to subcontractor performance, no prior projects with prior collaborations, did not include management and monitoring plan, subcontractor proposed not adequate for entire SOW of project, brief management plan but overall lack of understanding
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	30	asked for detailed approach and proposal was limited in detail, no examples, or does not address full SOW in RFP, lack of understanding on tribal communities, mention on workforce specialty access, no information on cultural community context, limited information on roles, key outcomes, missing detailed in response
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	10	lacks details and planned approach, limited understanding with MT tribes, provided information regarding other tribes culturally, did not provide detail working with tribal communities or unique issues faced by tribes, no indication of specific tribal MT communities with any detail
Population Health Interventions	100	60	response was high level, limited information on evaluation, data sources and tools for intervention pilots, proposal overall may have answered this question, not necessarily this specific question, good data on educational approach, lacked details on reducing cost

Offeror (Company) Name: Healthy Interactions			Total Points Awarded: 870
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Access to Preferred Rates	100	0	Did not address the question, no mention of existing relationships or ensure services
Partnership Development	100	10	Vague mention with other RHTP programs but no examples provided, did not answer question, minimally discussed partnerships for their proposed activities
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	0	Did not provide a response specifically,
Cost Savings Tracking	50	0	Not provided
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	10	Some clinical provided but nothing for the Hub-and-spoke model, high level for telehealth but more detail needed for capabilities,
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	0	Did not address item,
Sustainability & Scalability	50	0	Question regarding telehealth and response was not tied to telehealth, only pertained to educator workforce
Mobile Vans	50	0	No response to this question
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	0	Non responsive
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	0	Non responsive
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	0	Non responsive
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	0	Non responsive
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	Due to state issue in documentation, all vendors receive full points
Interfacility Transport System	N/A		N/A
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A		N/A
Value Added Offerings	N/A		N/A

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R

RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 5000 points: The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

Offeror (Company) Name: Hilltop Grp			Total Points Awarded: 1643
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Scope of Services/Provision of Services			
Implementation Approach	150	90	did not fully address the RFP requirements, additional detail needed to determine phases of implementation and collaboration with CoE were missing, details included strategy specific, implementation specialists and subcontractors named for geographical challenges, partnerships included
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	30	confirmed they would comply but no details or explanation on what will be completed or items not delivered on time, specific methodologies included, org chart, more details could be included on use of tools and examples, information had gaps in workflow assessments, onboarding
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	30	strategies included but lacked tie back to rhtp specifics, more detail needed, example provided difficult to determine how milestones would be managed,
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	30	did not address how to gather information for each area of transformation, did identify areas of risk, needed more detail for all areas of SOW, including grant management, mobile units and facility repairs, did not address corrective action plans, sustainability planning was described and risk expectation, items missing, focusing on telehealth and not the other CoE recommendations
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	35	Did address technical assistance and financial modeling, but limited on details, appreciated in-person support. Details included for each items, prior clinical workflows included success for small facilities without QI staff, TA for interpreting data, still lacking info on tools or examples, appreciate dedicated tribal liaison
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	58	described lean workflow optimization, data-driven decision making, described how applied previously to reduce admissions, lacked specific details on how/ why project was successful, rural readiness was detailed, example provided did not go into detail on how method aided to success, domains listed was helpful, clear plan, identified tools used,

Offeror (Company) Name: Hilltop Grp			Total Points Awarded: 1643
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Change Management Plan	50	25	needed to expand more on items provided, high-level response, no additional details as requested, facility-specific adoption plans, dashboard descriptions but missing details on tailoring for rural staff
Incentive Program Tracking	50	25	Did not say how they will complete this, did not address all scope targets included or information on monitoring and reporting, did include description on KPI dashboards and milestone tracking, success in the past for telehealth, no mention of other CoE tasks, did not include reporting
Final Reporting	50	30	Key elements are described, but no process for developing a report is included. Areas missing include patient experience, facility experience, grant management, and findings
Use of Subcontractors	250	100	response did not identify subcontractors for rfp, did not address why they were chosen or include any details of experience, subcontractor management and monitoring plan was inconsistent with response, subcontractors were included with minimal information, dermatology specialty, plan was included
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	70	high-level address components but did not provide a detail, example regarding tele-dermatology, more details are needed, lacked details in setting, outcomes achieved in previous work, protocols for previous work with other tribes was good,
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	25	Did address data, protocols and governance, lacked details on challenges faced in tribal communities, lack of understanding of those areas, no mention of other items mentioned in question,
Population Health Interventions	100	60	focused on area of chronic disease areas, lacks detail to determine approach, did not include details on tools using, example for tele-dermatology, explained focus areas, data sources, lacked detail on design and how the interventions would produce outcomes
Access to Preferred Rates	100	70	laid out a reasonable process for assessing needs, establishing relationships, needed more detail on facilities able to access those, no existing partnerships, minimal details on facilitating partnerships, did provide explanation for financial support for facilities
Partnership Development	100	65	slightly brief, examples of success of past partnerships was good, needed more detail on successful partnerships and how to develop new partnerships, structures matchmaking but needed more details

Offeror (Company) Name: Hilltop Grp			Total Points Awarded: 1643
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	25	responses high level, lacking detail to determine negotiation or rates, did not include info on the frontier/rural provider, did not state how to carry out negotiations or identify who they would be negotiating with, did not address second part of question, lacked some details, did describe to strengthen negotiating power but needed more information on approach
Cost Savings Tracking	50	25	stated would provide support but lacking details to fully understand how this will be delivered, details on TA with dashboards, cost saving reports, data interpretation, high-level response, missing details tools, dashboard methodologies
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	50	needs more detail on selection and training for provider engagement, also needed more specifics on how they have been successful in past projects, outside of dermatology, focused on dermatology, no mention on if this would be expanded to other specialties,
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	30	will facilitate pediatric virtual care and connect with qualified specialists, but no mention on how to identify specialists or how to engage them, did not include family information, needed more detail on how in MT this would be addressed, did include tech support
Sustainability & Scalability	50	30	need for integrating telehealth to ensure sustainability, but a tele dermatology-driven response, missing other areas from RFP, specifics on strategies for telehealth with billing practices and clinical integration, needed more detail on scalability and more services expanding outside of dermatology
Mobile Vans	50	30	breakdown of services: a refurbished van would be sufficient vs. specialty units for expanded services; design included partnerships with data use and scheduling. Response did not include collaboration or share how vans would be determined or equipped for specific services, more detail
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	60	The response did not address how experts would be selected for task in detail, could not determine level of support when construction is not on target, did not include process for assessment for renovations, lacking compliance requirements, needed more information on experts are consulted with, did include details on compliance verification process with roster of experts and priority scheduling
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	80	high level, general response, only example related to tele-dermatology, or details on how to comply with CoE recommendations outside of dermatology, some strategies listed on outpatient care delivery, redesign, community health, more examples needed

Offeror (Company) Name: Hilltop Grp			Total Points Awarded: 1643
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	65	project management support explained, construction oversight needed explained further, facility type, felt that it was high level, lacking details to track implementation updates or contracted vendors in compliance, unclear details on how and who and monitor vendor compliance, did not address buy-in for safe spaces
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	25	response was general and did not define approach to prioritizing upgrades, or getting buy in from providers, additionally, example provided was not detailed, additional support and funding opportunities, usda grant, needed more information on EHR modernization, success in past projects
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	Due to state issue in documentation, all vendors receive full points
Interfacility Transport System	N/A		Included that it would be supported, high level
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A		briefly touched on,
Value Added Offerings	N/A		N/A, Equal pay compliance,

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R

RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 5000 points: The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

Offeror (Company) Name: MT Health Research			Total Points Awarded: 3638
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Scope of Services/Provision of Services			
Implementation Approach	150	145	comprehensive response, information provided in detail for MT, provided knowledge regarding recommendation, details regarding CoE vendor, good examples provided, really good plan on orienting facilities, establishing buy in,
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	48	understood depth of scope, detailed, clear examples of dashboards and frameworks utilized, along with planning processes, provided detailed tools and IT platforms to leverage for project, provided visuals
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	48	detailed tools and dashboards, with 2 examples, tracking tasks using reference numbers, risk flags, timing of dashboards, answered all questions, examples very relevant
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	49	Specific details for each strategy, identified areas of risk, mitigation strategies, and data validation, good recognition of tribal and gov-to-gov.
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	48	Excellent to identify, details on TA provided for capacity needs and provider/entity type, strong data and financial modeling, compelling response regarding specific response for rural/frontier/tribal communities, data analysis, relationship building, codesign
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	70	methodologies provided were well-thought-out, needed more details on past projects and how to introduce information to providers, detail of the readiness assessment framework, codevelopment of sight level development plan, needing more detail in the examples
Change Management Plan	50	46	Response provided dcc model and obtaining staff buy-in, good examples of utilization of method, framework, and plans were strong, examples needed more detail, case study examples, unclear regarding lead or responsible role for those examples

Offeror (Company) Name: MT Health Research			Total Points Awarded: 3638
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Incentive Program Tracking	50	45	provided a clear plan and outputs, addressed gathering from facilities and standardizing among facilities, helpful visual examples, understood the design of the incentive program, dashboard examples, comprehensive response, did find enough detail in course correction or escalations in bid response
Final Reporting	50	40	wanting more detail in process of developing report, key elements and examples of reports provided by subcontractors, good visuals provided, missing some final reporting, lacking high level details, did not provide a timeline for providing the report
Use of Subcontractors	250	245	Very comprehensive response provided details of each subcontractor, outlined responsibilities, great details for subcontractor monitoring plan, covered the scope of work, description of each subcontract was very detailed, monitoring plan comprehensive
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	120	demonstrated thorough grasp on MT frontier community space, details regarding risks and challenges, opportunities, covered all topics in detail, some challenges provided that were not required, innovative opportunities, examples provided, accountability relationship sometimes unclear depending on roles/responsibilities, explanations adopting strategies regarding rhtp were detailed, examples provided good explanation that will be adapted to Montana
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	45	detailed and covered required issues, some not as detailed in response, limited information regarding collaboration MCUIH, or other tribal community organizations, detailed response with tribal government,
Population Health Interventions	100	95	Priority areas and data sources utilized, including bscc, data sharing agreements, response provided tools and examples, needed more detail in examples, state health improvement plan, CoE recommendations, clear evaluation, and proposed areas of focus, intervention tools, fully described approach, and provided past examples that were not required with this question
Access to Preferred Rates	100	95	excellent access based on proposal, needed more information on how to get facilities enrolled, able to meet unique rural and frontier needs for providers, existing partnerships were expansive to support rural facilities,
Partnership Development	100	90	provided details on partnerships, collaboration opportunities on required topics and specific examples of success outcomes, some less technical details regarding relationship details would have been helpful, needed more detail on clinical partnerships

Offeror (Company) Name: MT Health Research			Total Points Awarded: 3638
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	48	great description of negotiation processes, details on challenges regarding rural, with plan to address,
Cost Savings Tracking	50	50	clear process plan and tools, establish facility baseline, standardize baseline visual dashboards and tracking tools, internal capacity building, images and roi calculator, appreciate hard savings vs soft savings
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	94	strong understanding of telehealth, strategies, supporting use of existing infrastructure, phased implementation, provider engagement training, case studies provided but not required, provider engagement training-nurse and it staff training included, hands-off approach to technology solutions may include fragmentation, needed some details regarding connected systems across state
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	45	good approach including rural and frontier approach, outlining conditions pathways, remote patient monitoring was good, understanding the need of involving caregivers, needed more detail on including pediatrician, caregiver involvement, rural specific strategies, community partnerships, training for change management,
Sustainability & Scalability	50	47	Pre-deployment screening questions were good, vendor accountability management, approach to available reimbursement, scalability response was clear with specific strategies, detailed understanding of billing, coding, challenges, and providing ongoing billing compliance TA, financial modeling, 4 areas were described for scalability strategies, determined who is ready to onboard or cohorts regarding scalability
Mobile Vans	50	50	need-based purchasing framework, solid approach to determine used vs new, comprehensive explanation regarding equipment, workforce outcomes were addressed though not required, metrics and targets, units integrated and established providers, proposed equity-driven routing of mobile vans going where services are needed.
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	95	Included audit readiness in TA for compliance verification, additionally provided breakdown and prioritized using ROM, did not address performance issues of experts, prioritization model, TA tools and strategies, screening and processing tools, SME network,
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	140	good understanding of potential recommendations, identified how to approach carrying out, strategies explained in detail, approach description, examples of similar projects provided,

Offeror (Company) Name: MT Health Research			Total Points Awarded: 3638
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	95	replicated responses, would have liked to see more detail specific to this question, safe places was described in detail, call out of real-estate compliance regarding involvement
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	46	Response provided several examples, EHR starting points, good detail on cohorts, addressed lab result routing, tracking, and implementation checklists, community connect only mentioned Epic in response, needed more information, collaboration with HIE
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	Due to state issue in documentation, all vendors receive full points
Interfacility Transport System	N/A		did include with joint gov body, a little unclear regarding tech information, sustainability matrix provided,
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A		sustainability matrix provided, no mention of existing interfacility transport systems that are functioning currently, larger systems vs smaller systems,
Value Added Offerings	N/A		reiterated what was proposed

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R

RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 5000 points: The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

Offeror (Company) Name: Palindrome Level			Total Points Awarded: 310
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Scope of Services/Provision of Services			
Implementation Approach	150	0	not addressed, no response
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	0	no response
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	0	No response
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	0	No response
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	0	No response
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	0	No response
Change Management Plan	50	0	No response
Incentive Program Tracking	50	0	No response
Final Reporting	50	0	No response
Use of Subcontractors	250	0	No response
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	0	No response
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	0	No response
Population Health Interventions	100	0	No response
Access to Preferred Rates	100	0	No response
Partnership Development	100	0	No response
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	0	No response
Cost Savings Tracking	50	0	No response
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	0	No response
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	0	No response
Sustainability & Scalability	50	0	No response
Mobile Vans	50	0	No response, appropriate equipment that the vendor owns could be utilized, lacking detail
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	0	No response
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	0	No response
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	0	No response
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	0	No response

Offeror (Company) Name: Palindrome Level			Total Points Awarded: 310
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	Due to state issue in documentation, all vendors receive full points
Interfacility Transport System	N/A		provide transportation
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A	N/A	
Value Added Offerings	N/A	N/A	

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R

RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 5000 points: The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

Offeror (Company) Name: RSM US LLP			Total Points Awarded: 1865
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Scope of Services/Provision of Services			
Implementation Approach	150	110	grants management approach, monitoring milestones, no collaboration with CoE vendor, concerned with understanding building relationships, clear understanding of implementation role, change management, telehealth, lacked details on relationships and collaboration
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	45	detailed, addressed all elements, with a clear plan, project management approach, 5-phased approach
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	40	master schedule, tools and performance monitoring, examples of similar projects, initial response on disaster recovery and claims management- not consistent with this RFP SOW
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	37	no revenue or cost savings, would research options, looking beyond obvious funding sources, risk assessments, description, response, high level, and needed more detail at facility level specifics, depth of sustainability response but lacking in detail with minimal mitigation strategies proposed
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	35	lacking detail, does not encompass all areas of capacity building, high level without detail
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	55	detailed data structure, including different methodologies, did not include past examples of this structure, onboarding did not include or gain facility buy-in or engagement
Change Management Plan	50	35	Good description of change management, needed more details on the example provided, high-level response, tailoring to rural environments may be unrealistic, not enough detail on rural, tailored approach
Incentive Program Tracking	50	30	generic response, unsure how to connect providers to tracking, or if targets are not met, some description provided, not enough detail on accountability and management of facilities

Offeror (Company) Name: RSM US LLP			Total Points Awarded: 1865
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Final Reporting	50	15	Lacking in detail on elements to be included in the report and process, high level response, missing key components of final report, response for a different rfp
Use of Subcontractors	250	150	formatted response, outlined contractors, split by each component of questions, unsure of the capabilities of subcontractors, unsure if all scope is covered with a list of subcontractors,
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	80	Detail lacking, tailoring for frontier and tribal communities was lacking, a generic response, examples were not relevant to the project regarding rural/frontier and healthcare
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	10	Did not demonstrate understanding of the question or challenges if tribal communities, a generic response on communication, missing cultural differences based on tribes, missing reference to tribal communities, only stakeholder engagement
Population Health Interventions	100	85	design outputs and focus areas, risk adjustments, high-level in reducing cost of care and was limited in detail, well thought out in design, pilots and focus areas, needed more detail
Access to Preferred Rates	100	80	decent framework, supporting providers in accessing services provided through GPOs, 2/3rds of responses were not relevant, concerns with attention to detail with response, proposal to access group purchasing, billing, revenue cycle, through gpo relationships, limited detail on current contracts or how preferred rates would be available to frontier/rural facilities
Partnership Development	100	80	strategy around coordination, communicate with stakeholders, limited information on existing partnerships or how to utilize MT partnerships with a specific ask around rural health systems, lacking elaboration of items requested, examples of successful partnerships is difficult to find relevance to project
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	29	Response was high level, did not provide detail, ask was around benefits for rural frontier providers and response was lacking to determine for this area, not enough relevant detail
Cost Savings Tracking	50	38	clear, address providing assistance to facilities, would like more regarding examples, first paragraph is for a different question, description of dashboards, financial reconciliation, track costs, audit ready for documentation, reference tools, systems, and reports, more detail is needed

Offeror (Company) Name: RSM US LLP			Total Points Awarded: 1865
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	74	touched on specific models asked, gave thorough descriptions of other requests for provider coaching, education, deployment, needed more detail on technology options and selection process with MT specifics, did not address hub and spoke participation would be determined, implementation readiness does not explain what to do when they find the infrastructure is not adequate, noting only a phased approach for those situations,
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	29	some good points but did not address how recommendations would be determined, provider engagement, coaching, caregivers, simulation preparation, and missing specific details
Sustainability & Scalability	50	40	identified key elements needed, planning ahead, listed a telehealth coordinator role in each organization and the workforce capacity will be limited for this expectation, revenue cycle specifics and coding, did provide specifics on scalability regarding networks and collaboration with partners,
Mobile Vans	50	35	proposed procurement and deployment, with some demonstration of understanding on descriptive, cost-benefit analysis, examples of previous work via subcontractor, lacking in specifics on service lines that needed more detail on how it would be fulfilled, missing current community providers for coordinating,
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	45	did provide some details but missing who or how subcontractors would be for renovations, may have misunderstood the magnitude of this task, potentially for a different proposal (Broadband), missing health care SMEs, described oversight engineers and contractors, scoring and prioritizing repairs, but lacked detail in expert availability or compliance verification processes, including SMEs,
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	50	did not understand services requested, examples not relevant, minimal details, provided details on operational, accountability for recommendations, high level and needed more detail on specifics, did not provide a strategy for creating lower acuity footprints in communities, which was requested in the SOW, provided additional response pertaining to Broadband
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	50	description of modernization, coordination of contractors, clinical impact score, experience in managing multifacility capital projects, little to no detail on behavioral health on tribal clinics and safe places for help, 2 components were asked for and vendor did not provide a response to, assisting facilities was tied to project management, but did not include the work with vendors or subcontractors to help support the work

Offeror (Company) Name: RSM US LLP			Total Points Awarded: 1865
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	30	Did provide details on facility assistance for readiness, but wanted more details on options that could be presented to facilities to identify needs. Did not include engagement of facilities or capacity building, assessment and feasibility studies, security and access, technical and lacked in detail on how to support facilities in work. The example was not relevant
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	Due to state issue in documentation, all vendors receive full points
Interfacility Transport System	N/A		provided a response but minimal information,
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A		provided a response but minimal information, high level
Value Added Offerings	N/A		provided f response but minimal information, high level

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R			
RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 5000 points: The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Urgent Care			Total Points Awarded: 1389
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Scope of Services/Provision of Services			
Implementation Approach	150	35	The implementation approach does not encompass the entire scope of the RFP, missing major components,
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	25	some detailed plans and frameworks, did not apply to specifics of project, significant gaps in management and operational plan,
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	25	minimal details and approach to multiple projects, examples not detailed to provide information, did not address all complexity of SOW, examples not adequate,
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	30	identified risks well, only proposed 1 model for sustainability, unclear from compliance that this would be operating under, risks and mitigation, details on mitigation strategies were missing, did not address all areas of scope.
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	30	The layered approach was well thought out, limited in data analysis and financial modeling, missing components of capacity building for workforce training and workflows, 3 layers, reserved spots for heavily operated clinics, did not cover all aspects of rfp,
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	45	minimal detail of approach, high level, not capable of determining full capabilities, did not include relevant successful examples,
Change Management Plan	50	40	clearly talked about framework, appreciated engagement staff and design partners, understood importance of clinician workload, did not fully address entire scope of project, example included a single instance of success
Incentive Program Tracking	50	30	described mechanisms for data tracking, reporting, monitoring, but lacked specifics on experience or relevance. Needed additional information,
Final Reporting	50	32	Response included high level but not specifics, did appreciate HHS reviewers, lacked detail, mapping to CMS use of funds and sub initiatives, lacked in details in development process or timeline for report
Use of Subcontractors	250	75	Did not yet have subcontractors identified or named, management and monitoring plan is high level, no existing partnerships,

Offeror (Company) Name: Urgent Care			Total Points Awarded: 1389
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	75	An example of previous work is a conceptual example, not enough detail or understanding of need,
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	30	recognize specific challenges, working with tribes, but did not name a subcontractor for the team as tribal liaison, not detailed on approach, gap in understanding who or how to carry out work, limited direct experience or subcontractor that does, commitment of importance and challenges, missing how to address or support current issues
Population Health Interventions	100	62	provided a solid framework, potential area of focus, did not include examples beyond musculoskeletal or clarity on data or tools, needed more detail on tools and focus areas outside,
Access to Preferred Rates	100	30	deferred to an unnamed subcontractor without any additional information on execution, show understand requirements without a subcontractor or plan
Partnership Development	100	30	did recognize relationships, building of relationships would fall to the partnership role, and subcontractor not listed, response includes Medicaid managed entities, which MT does not have, does not specifically mention partnerships among rural health systems as requested
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	20	uncertain on who the subcontractor would be, relevant response but not enough details, no negotiation experience mentioned, just deferred to subcontractor,
Cost Savings Tracking	50	25	needs more details on tools, dashboards, training, to use and understand savings as the question asked, the approach with a historical baseline was confusing, narrow in scope, lacking in assistance to facilities to be completed
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	30	did not provide details, indicating responsibility would fall on an unnamed subcontractor, unable to evaluate, needed more detail
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	20	depending on a subcontractor, who was not named, PT was included and not relevant to project,
Sustainability & Scalability	50	25	Did include model with some phased approach for scaling, some frameworks, still lacking in tools and data sources, how to inform model, missing information, MT does not have managed care entities, appreciated scalability design choices, thought behind telehealth cost savings,
Mobile Vans	50	25	Recognized with tribal was necessary, this falls to the unnamed subcontractor, unable to determine capabilities without the information,
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	35	commitment to delivering requirements but unable to provide subcontractor information to determine, lacks detail on unnamed contractor or SMEs,

Offeror (Company) Name: Urgent Care			Total Points Awarded: 1389
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	75	Did demonstrate understanding and expectation, but only specific to musculoskeletal and PT, which is a narrow scope compared to this RFP,
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	35	high-level description and subcontractor carrying out, no additional information
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	25	some relevant knowledge among EHR systems, difficult to evaluate without contractor information,
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	Due to state issue in documentation, all vendors receive full points
Interfacility Transport System	N/A		Provided the same standard response with the subcontractor
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A		Provided the same standard response with the subcontractor
Value Added Offerings	N/A		N/A

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R			
RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 5000 points: The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Wellness Equity			Total Points Awarded: 1724
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Scope of Services/Provision of Services			
Implementation Approach	150	130	addressed implementation approach, working with CoE, information scattered throughout the proposal, detailed approach with phases and milestones, TA for multidisciplinary teams, collaborate with entities involved,
Project Management & Operational Planning	50	36	Specific frameworks and tools, aligned with the requirements of the question. Additional detail needed to determine capabilities, high level,
Workplan & Milestone Management	50	30	high-level and milestone management, examples are not detailed enough,
Long-Term Sustainability & Risk Management	50	36	high level, did demonstrate understanding of importance, and depth of facility types, but lacking detail and risk assessment and mitigation was limited on information, facility-specific revenue strategies broken down by type, monitoring risk management, missing examples or proposal of tools, dashboards, or data sources. needed more MT specific risk examples,
Capacity Building for Rural Providers	50	35	strategies included for supporting workflow redesign, telehealth, which were consistent with the question, assessing readiness, and onboarding, lacking detail on unique needs. Needing more information for financial modeling and data analysis
Clinical & Operational Redesign Methodology	75	55	general response, included readiness framework but missing details of components, needed more detail, understanding of different pieces needed for operationalizing clinical redesign, lacked details and examples were vague, not enough clinical details regarding operational redesign
Change Management Plan	50	30	Identified the important principles behind change management. missing information, high level, response did not include how it would be communicated
Incentive Program Tracking	50	30	suggest quality/beneficial proposal, data, score cards, financial tracking, but do not go into detail regarding the names of tools or examples, missing information regarding performance monitoring and risk management,

Offeror (Company) Name: Wellness Equity			Total Points Awarded: 1724
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Final Reporting	50	30	high level, description of final reporting, did not address Department report, missing key elements for final report, did not provide a timeline,
Use of Subcontractors	250	70	limited detail, no monitoring or management plan, no subcontractors identified,
Focus on Montana's Most Rural Frontier Communities	125	65	brief, not enough detail, too high level, no examples provided,
Focus on Tribal Communities	50	35	provided response on communication and leveraging existing partnerships, did not address challenges faced by tribal communities, missing details, do not address specific challenges,
Population Health Interventions	100	60	short on details, high level, stated to utilize tools but no examples were provided
Access to Preferred Rates	100	55	high level, not enough detail, did not provide detail on facilities, affordable with specific needs of facilities,
Partnership Development	100	55	high level response, no examples of successful partnerships, did not explain how partnerships would be built,
Negotiation of Preferred Rates	50	25	committed to, but did not include how to or examples
Cost Savings Tracking	50	25	Proposed dashboards for tracking, but did not provide example metrics or samples or images, vague response, didn't explain how to provide technical assistance to providers,
Hub-and-Spoke Telehealth Model	100	65	Didn't provide details on technical I implementation how it would be selected, or providers would be engaged, who would be the hub and spoke, high-level, found information earlier in proposal, provided a list for implementation support, hub system partners listed elsewhere,
Pediatric Virtual Care	50	38	limited on detail, though integrated into telehealth response, plan for family access and milestone access, but high-level, information scattered across proposal,
Sustainability & Scalability	50	30	information scattered across proposal,
Mobile Vans	50	40	did provide some information, approach including vendor selection through the GPO section, needed more information on community needs, selection and operations, included routes with community input in a separate section of the response,
Technical Advisory for Renovations	100	50	no plan for how to implement or who to contract with, limited information,
Support for Sub-Initiative CoE recommendation implementation	150	89	discuss operational planning without specifics, high level, workplan does include layout of activities to milestones, no examples of similar projects,
Support for Sub-Initiative 4.2 Facility Modernization	100	60	state they will do this but do not include list facilities, no specific examples,
Technology Upgrades for Efficiency	50	30	scattered throughout response, level of detail is lacking, not enough experience with rural or MT,

Offeror (Company) Name: Wellness Equity			Total Points Awarded: 1724
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Consumer-Facing EHR Modules & Engagement	50	50	Due to state issue in documentation, all vendors receive full points
Interfacility Transport System	N/A		brief, high level response,
Streamlined Transfers & Real-Time Data	N/A		brief, high level response,
Value Added Offerings	N/A		discussed experience with integrated behavioral health, outpatient-oriented community based services,

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R
RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

11

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines:

Superior Response (95-100%): A superior response is an exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response may cover areas not originally addressed within the RFP and/or include additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.

Good Response (75-94%): A good response clearly meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in an unambiguous and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.

Fair Response (60-74%): A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

Failed Response (59% or less): A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

	50	75	100	125	150	250
Superior (95-100%)	47 - 50	70.5 - 75	94 - 100	117.5 - 125	141 - 150	235 - 250

Scoring Calculator

SH	100.0%
SL	94.0%
GH	94.0%
GL	74.0%
FH	74.0%
FL	59.0%
FDH	59.0%
FDL	0.0%

Total Points Available

Score		250
Superior (95-100%)	235 - 250	
Good (75-94%)	185 - 235	
Fair (60-74%)	147.5 - 185	
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 147.5	

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R
RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

Cost Worksheet

Lowest overall cost receives the maximum allotted points. All other proposals receive a percentage of the points available based on their cost relationship to the lowest. Example: Total possible points for cost are 300. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 300 points. Offeror B would receive 200 points ($\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 300 \text{ points} = 200$).

Cost			
Points Available		1000	
Lowest Cost		295840000.00	
Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Points Earned	Notes:
Healthy Interactions	8710000.00	0.0	
Hilltop Grp Inc	24316448.00	0.0	
Montana Health Research & Education Foundation	295840000.00	1000.0	
Palindrome Level Transport	135200.00	0.0	
RSM US LLP	16245000.00	0.0	
Urgent Care Physical Therapy	35858000.00	0.0	
Wellness Equity Alliance	263292270.00	0.0	

Technical Scoring Session

DPHHS-RFP-2026-0670R

RHTP Center of Excellence - Implementation

June 15, 2026 Day 1

9:00-2:30 PM, MDT

Teams

Evaluation Committee Members:

Mary LeMieux, Amanda Aby, Amanda I

Contracts Officer:

Rhonda Peters

Order of Evaluation: Alphabetical

Scoring Method: Consensus

6/16/2026 Day 2

9:00-4:00 PM MDT