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:

RHTP-Montana Community Health Aide Program (CHAP) Technical Assistance

Solicitation Number: DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV

Solicitation Close Date: 10/01/2026

Notice of Intent to Award Posting Date: 10/23/2026

Issuing Contracts Officer/Contact Information: Patrick Navarro
patrick.navarro@mt.gov

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.

In accordance with the Montana Procurement Act, the State has made available for public inspection the relevant scoring matrix/bid tab for the above-mentioned solicitation. 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)

CKF CONSULTING

UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR(S)

CALLING OUR SPIRITS FORWARD - NOKOMIS STRATEGIES
KAUFFMAN & ASSOCIATES - MOUNTAIN QUALITY HEALTH FOUNDATION
WELLNESS EQUITY ALLIANCE

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV								
RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE								
SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET								
	CATEGORY	**Possible Points**	CKF Consulting	Calling Our Spirits Forward	Kauffman & Associates, Inc.	Mountain Quality Health Foundation	Nokomis Strategies	Wellness Equity Alliance
SECTION	**Technical Evaluation / Scope of Work**							
	Final Pass/Fail for Administrative Description							
Technical Scoring	1. Statewide Technical Assistance	300 points	290	FAILED	250	240	180	FAILED
	2. Cross-Pillar Integration and Subject-Matter Expertise	300 points	295	0	230	260	180	0
	3. Tribal and THO Readiness Assessments	250 points	248	0	187	215	155	0
	4. Clinical Integration	250 points	245	0	188	220	175	0
	5. Education Pathways and TCU Capacity	250 points	250	0	180	210	180	0
	6. BACB and Certification System Development	250 points	250	0	175	235	190	0
	7. Shared Clinical, Education, and Certification Tools	250 points	247	0	187	220	180	0
	8. Workforce, Preceptor, and Supervisor Development	250 points	245	0	165	200	185	0
	9. Data, Reporting, and Continuous Quality Improvement	250 points	245	0	190	230	185	0
	11. Project Timeline and Implementation Schedule	250 points	250	0	155	140	190	0
	10. Learning Community and Knowledge Transfer	250 points	244	0	187	230	160	0
	12. Proposal Timeline	250 points	250	0	140	230	220	0
Offeror Qualifications								
	References	300 points	300	0	230	230	200	0
	Company Profile and Experience	300 points	300	0	240	220	230	0
	Resume	300 points	300	0	240	230	220	0
Cost Proposal								
	Cost Proposal	1000 Points	911	0	911	1000	931	0
Technical Subtotal	3,100		3059	0	2234	2630	2180	0
Offeror Qualifications	900		900	0	710	680	650	0
Cost Proposal	1,000		911	0	911	1000	931	0
Total Points	5,000		4870	0	3855	4310	3761	0
FINAL TOTAL	5,000		4870	0	3855	4310	3761	0

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV

RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

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% x 300 points = 200).

Cost			
Points Available	**1000**		
Lowest Cost	$5,010,820.00		

Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Points Earned	Notes:
CKF Consulting	$5,500,000.00	911.1	
Calling Our Spirits	$5,500,000.00	0.0	Failed scoring. Cost not calculated
Kauffman	$5,499,851.00	911.1	
Mountain Quality	$5,010,820.00	1000.0	
Nokomis	$5,384,811.00	930.5	
Wellness Equity	$5,492,096.00	0.0	Failed scoring. Cost not calculated

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV

RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.

Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
CKF Consulting				**4870**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section				
SECTION	**Technical Evaluation / Scope of Work**		**Score**	**Justification Notes**
Technical Scoring	1. Statewide Technical Assistance	300 points	290	Foundational, institutional knowledge of CHAP. This proposal, as it spoke to almost every single thing that we had put in the in the background, in the purpose of this, it lined them out. It talked about the difference between just TA and tribal TA, and then that Montana component was really big. State access to Teams. Thoughtfully addressed every item. CHAP experience. Tech inclusion with specifics in their plan to provide TA. Startup kickoff in person. TA log tracking management that was online only.
	2. Cross-Pillar Integration and Subject-Matter Expertise	300 points	295	The vendor demonstrates a clear and comprehensive understanding of the three CHAP pillars, including how they interconnect and function together. Their proposal shows strong cross-pillar integration, addresses every required item and more, and outlines all three workstreams with clarity. They developed a detailed list of coordination activities, addressed risk management, and took the time to specifically identify Montana's components. They explain how the pillars interact within the Montana context and clearly identify who will be responsible for each activity. They include elements such as Medicaid enrollment EHR and the development of standardized tools.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
CKF Consulting				**4870**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	3. Tribal and THO Readiness Assessments	250 points	248	They emphasize trust-building with tribes and address all three pathways using existing information while avoiding duplication. A key strength is their commitment to tribally guided data gathering rather than a one-size-fits-all model. Participation is voluntary and tribe-initiated. They list Montana partners, consider relationships holistically, and provide CHAP-specific implementation roadmaps. Their approach incorporates prior CHAP knowledge and includes detailed plans for working with each tribe and translating findings into useful summaries.
	4. Clinical Integration	250 points	245	Their technical assistance plan for clinical integration is thorough. Inclusion of tribal leadership exceeds expectations, and they highlight cooperation across clinical sites. They demonstrate a clear understanding of what successful clinical integration requires, incorporate lessons from past CHAP work, recognize differences between Montana and Alaska, identify all CHAP pathways, and show strong comprehension of the infrastructure. Listening sessions are included.
	5. Education Pathways and TCU Capacity	250 points	250	They show a strong understanding of CHAP pathways and focus on reducing barriers rather than screening people out. They describe student supports, clearly define partner roles versus TA roles, and present a comprehensive partner-support approach. Their grasp of Montana tribal government and Indigenous knowledge is strong. Cultural preservation is emphasized. They understand CHAP programs, recognize the foundational role of TCUs, describe how they will build the program, identify existing TCU strengths, reference the CBE model, and note the existence of a student handbook.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
CKF Consulting				**4870**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	6. BACB and Certification System Development	250 points	250	They appropriately reference tribal sovereignty in relation to standards and certification boards. The CHAP certifications align with federal law, which is crucial when navigating tribal and federal legal frameworks. Their use of IHS circular guidance suggests relevant prior experience. Their proposal is rooted in tribal sovereignty and details support for committees, training, and workflows.
	7. Shared Clinical, Education, and Certification Tools	250 points	247	They propose using Montana-specific knowledge to create a shared approach that unites all three pillars. They outline supervision protocols and personnel requirements for CHAP, demonstrating strong subject matter expertise and understanding of TCUs and tribes. Their plan reflects past experience, including ECHAM and EBAM, and uses lessons learned to guide future collaboration. They emphasize working with Montana Tribes, assessing existing capacity, avoiding redundancy, and relying on tribally grounded methods.
	8. Workforce, Preceptor, and Supervisor Development	250 points	245	They describe the pathway from student to employment, emphasizing that retention begins before training and continues through professional advancement. They address every requirement thoroughly, identify pathways and bridging opportunities, and tailor approaches to each tribe. Peer groups were not specifically mentioned. Deliverables include detailed timelines. Recruitment and pathway descriptions reflect Montana's CHAP needs while maintaining tribal and pillar autonomy. Determinants of health are included with practical examples.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
CKF Consulting				**4870**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	9. Data, Reporting, and Continuous Quality Improvement	250 points	245	Their data plan uses Microsoft tools for tracking but does not offer alternatives should tribes need them. They discuss data needs for DPHHS, CHAP, and TA sustainability, stressing that data must benefit tribes. They explain reporting, compliance, and the differences in CHAP data requirements. Their collection plan is clear, experience-based, and respects tribal sovereignty.
	10. Learning Community and Knowledge Transfer	250 points	244	They list extensive hands-on experience and explain how their knowledge will support CHAP development and create interconnected learning pathways. While functionality details may be limited, they describe past experience thoroughly. Their learning pathway list is comprehensive. Toolkits will be newly created, not reused, and their approach is collaborative. They incorporate mentorship models and demonstrate experience organizing CHAP events. In-person site visits are planned, though statewide gathering details are limited.
	11. Project Timeline and Implementation Schedule	250 points	250	Their proposal contains substantial detail essential to project success. All required information is included, and their performance table is complete. They expand on the scope of work and provide a detailed, thoughtful timeline.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.

Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
CKF Consulting				**4870**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	12. Proposal Timeline	250 points	250	The schedule includes leads, start dates, milestones, dependencies, and a five-year implementation plan. The activity chart is a helpful visual aid. Their timeline aligns with the resumes and experience provided, showing they are thinking ahead. All requested items are included, and contractor-controlled dates are clearly distinguished.
Offeror Qualifications				
	References	300 points	300	They show who will perform the work and demonstrate extensive TA and CHAP experience. They exceeded the minimum number of references and provided letters of support, including five tribal references spanning Montana, Portland, and Alaska.
	Company Profile and Experience	300 points	300	They supplied all required information and more. Although the company is relatively new, their submission highlights numerous innovative CHAP activities and—more importantly—lessons learned that directly support the scope of work. They have substantial CHAP experience, and the leads assigned appear appropriate.
	Resume	300 points	300	They demonstrate many years of CHAP experience, familiarity with Montana travel, and relevant public health backgrounds. They provided all required staff information and highlight a strong collective knowledge base, including extensive experience supporting CHAP work in Montana and other states.
STOP HERE				

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV				
RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Calling Our Spirits Forward				**FAILED**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section				
SECTION	**Technical Evaluation / Scope of Work**		**Score**	**Justification Notes - AFTER CONSENSUS DISCUSSION THIS VENDOR HAS FAILED AND WILL NOT BE SCORED ANY FURTHER**
Technical Scoring	1. Statewide Technical Assistance	300 points	FAILED	The offeror shows some TA experience and provides a basic TA package and multi-year technical work plan. They have limited Montana experience and included most required information, but their proposal lacks detail on rapid mobilization and knowledge transfer. Their mobilization approach is minimal, with no clear plan for engaging tribes. They provided an inventory of existing CHAP elements but did not include details or timelines.
	2. Cross-Pillar Integration and Subject-Matter Expertise	300 points		
	3. Tribal and THO Readiness Assessments	250 points		
	4. Clinical Integration	250 points		
	5. Education Pathways and TCU Capacity	250 points		

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Calling Our Spirits Forward				**FAILED**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	6. BACB and Certification System Development	250 points		
	7. Shared Clinical, Education, and Certification Tools	250 points		
	8. Workforce, Preceptor, and Supervisor Development	250 points		
	9. Data, Reporting, and Continuous Quality Improvement	250 points		
	10. Learning Community and Knowledge Transfer	250 points		
	11. Project Timeline and Implementation Schedule	250 points		
	12. Proposal Timeline	250 points		

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Calling Our Spirits Forward				**FAILED**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Offeror Qualifications				
	References	300 points		
	Company Profile and Experience	300 points		
	Resume	300 points		
STOP HERE				

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV				
RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Kauffman & Associates, Inc.				**3855**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section				
SECTION	**Technical Evaluation / Scope of Work**		**Score**	**Justification Notes**
Technical Scoring	1. Statewide Technical Assistance	300 points	250	The offeror outlines an opening plan but provides little Montana-specific CHAP knowledge and insufficient detail on the three pillars. TA components are present, but deliverables lack dates, and the proposal lacks clarity on TA-CHAP integration. There are no specifics on Montana personnel. While they touched on required elements and showed understanding of mobilization, engagement with tribes is unclear. They provide many deliverable details, including a master plan with a multi-day startup and coordination sessions. Their approach emphasizes tribal authority, culturally grounded engagement, and a lifecycle TA model.
	2. Cross-Pillar Integration and Subject-Matter Expertise	300 points	230	They provide all requested information but need a more detailed plan for developing standardized tools. Although they have CHAP experience, they did not highlight it here. They propose integrated CHAP teams with leads for each pillar but do not identify who will maintain the final product. Specifics and dependencies are lacking. They list methods for cross-pillar integration but do not describe how this would work with colleges or how TCUs will collaborate with the BCAB.
	3. Tribal and THO Readiness Assessments	250 points	187	They describe a culturally grounded readiness assessment that honors tribal authority, formal consultation, and government-to-government responsibility aligned with Montana code. They outline assessment activities but lack detail. They do explain how they would teach CHAP to tribes with limited understanding. They provide required information but do not incorporate past CHAP experience and need more detail on assessments. Deliverables only partially address gaps.

be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Kauffman & Associates, Inc.				**3855**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	4. Clinical Integration	250 points	188	They do not provide specifics for each CHAP provider scope. Their approach relies on tribes to handle implementation. They have limited clinical experience and rely heavily on the Portland Area Certification Board. They lack experience with Tribal Health departments. Deliverables are extensive, but responses to other prompts are basic. While they consider participating tribes, they do not address each CHAP pathway or explain how barriers will be addressed. They propose toolkits, templates, and support models, but key details are missing.
	5. Education Pathways and TCU Capacity	250 points	180	They submitted required information and a strong list of deliverables, but student recruitment and support lack detail. The student pathway—central to CHAP—is insufficiently developed, and TCUs are barely mentioned. They repeatedly reference the Oregon Certification Board. They propose reviewing documents, coordinating with decision-makers, and developing a certification approval process, but do not address alignment with national CHAP standards. Deliverables are strong, but there is no tribal engagement, no mention of RMTLC, and no linkage to Alaska's CHAP model. Their experience suggests they should have offered more.
	6. BACB and Certification System Development	250 points	175	The response proposes reviewing documents and drafts, coordinating with decision-makers, and designing and testing a certification approval process using existing materials. However, it does not address alignment with national CHAP standards and includes no evidence of tribal engagement. RMTLC and Alaska's CHAP model are not mentioned, nor is the establishment of the Billings Area Certification Board. Although the deliverables are strong, the narrative does not reflect the level of CHAP implementation experience suggested by the resumes and company profile.
	7. Shared Clinical, Education, and Certification Tools	250 points	187	They provide no specifics and little detail on developing clinical training manuals. They do not mention partners and did not fully answer the prompt. Deliverables help fill some gaps, but the narrative response is basic. They describe shared tools and technology requirements but ignore data sovereignty.

be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Kauffman & Associates, Inc.				**3855**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	8. Workforce, Preceptor, and Supervisor Development	250 points	165	Their descriptions are brief and lack a detailed plan for developing and supporting supervising providers and faculty networks. The statewide workforce approach is vague. Partner validation—critical for ensuring tribal priorities—appears but without depth. Deliverables are strong, but the narrative relies on technical jargon that does not translate into practical application for Montana tribes.
	9. Data, Reporting, and Continuous Quality Improvement	250 points	190	The deliverables include a data governance protocol and tribal partner feedback, but they lack a clear system for how tasks will be executed. They show strong understanding of tribal sovereignty but provide minimal implementation planning. Their narrative is heavy on data terminology without explaining how they will support tribes and partners in reporting. Their plan acknowledges the need to align with tribal and federal standards and protect sovereignty, but the overall approach to collecting, managing, and reporting TA and implementation data remains vague.
	10. Learning Community and Knowledge Transfer	250 points	187	They do not describe what knowledge will be transferred or provide specifics on CHAP partners. There is no Montana-specific staffing identified, though they state the program will transition to a Montana-based administration. They respond well to most requirements and provide detailed long-term transfer planning. However, they lack detail on learning opportunities and statewide learning activities, collaboratives, gatherings, conferences, and peer exchanges. They recognize tribal and partner priorities and propose strong approaches for validating and sharing practices. In-person gatherings are appropriately emphasized.
	11. Project Timeline and Implementation Schedule	250 points	155	They included substantial information but did not address several required elements. The narrative is difficult to follow. They include key milestones but missed corresponding connections earlier in the proposal.
	12. Proposal Timeline	250 points	140	Their five-year description is difficult to read and lacks specific detail for year one. Timelines—critical to CHAP implementation—are insufficient. The prompt requires a detailed five-year plan, but their response gives only general information.
Offeror Qualifications				

be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Kauffman & Associates, Inc.				**3855**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	References	300 points	230	They provided three references, but none are tribal or reservation-specific. Their CHAP experience relates only to IHS certification board work, not clinical integration or education. They meet the minimum requirement and include service descriptions, along with some tribal references, but no Montana references.
	Company Profile and Experience	300 points	240	They provided all required information and more. They appear well established with a stable team but lack Montana tribal experience. They provided profiles, experience, and some CHAP-related work. They demonstrate TA and tribal experience, though only aligned with national CHAP. They have been operating a long time.
	Resume	300 points	240	They have experience working with Indigenous populations and some CHAP-adjacent Montana work but no relevant CHAP BHA/DHA Medicaid experience. They provided resumes for all staff and highlighted combined knowledge of working in tribal communities.
STOP HERE				

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV				
RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Mountain Quality Health Foundation				**4310**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section				
SECTION	**Technical Evaluation / Scope of Work**		**Score**	**Justification Notes**
Technical Scoring	1. Statewide Technical Assistance	300 points	240	The response is well written and highly technical but does not mention TCUs. It outlines a centralized process for requesting TA and demonstrates extensive CHAP knowledge. Deliverables go above and beyond but lack timelines, and the proposal does not address funding for the three pillars. Although they provide a mobilization plan, it lacks timeframes. They propose starting with a listening session and describe how they will manage TA requests, but they do not specify the technology or timelines for intake and follow-up. Deliverables are numerous but briefly described. While they reference working with tribal liaisons, they refer to tribes as stakeholders rather than sovereign governments, raising concerns about their understanding of tribal sovereignty and appropriate engagement.
	2. Cross-Pillar Integration and Subject-Matter Expertise	300 points	260	The response contains a lot of information but is poorly organized and difficult to follow. They present plans for cross-pillar integration, and the diagram for this section is strong. They show understanding of the scope, but no previous CHAP experience is evident. They reference tribal sovereignty and note that Montana can learn from Alaska, but they fail to acknowledge that Montana tribes are fundamentally different. The section is generally well assembled but lacks a Montana-specific approach.
	3. Tribal and THO Readiness Assessments	250 points	215	The offeror uses a strength-based, multidimensional approach that builds on existing tribal knowledge and respects data sovereignty, but the narrative is difficult to follow. They demonstrate understanding of assessments and include extensive travel and readiness domains, using a tiered system, but offer no Montana-specific framework. Much of the language is tentative, suggesting they *may* complete certain tasks. They propose developing an implementation roadmap from assessment findings but show little incorporation of past CHAP experience. Overall, the section needs clearer structure and more detail.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Mountain Quality Health Foundation				**4310**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	4. Clinical Integration	250 points	220	The offeror lists all three CHAP scopes of work but does not provide a Montana-specific clinical integration plan. While they clearly incorporate CHAP requirements, they show limited past CHAP experience. The response includes substantial information, but it is unclear how it will translate into actionable steps. They address all three pathways, describe different models and integration strategies, and emphasize sustainability for each tribal nation. They reference existing clinical structures, supervision models, provider buy-in, telehealth evaluation, and note the importance of keeping learners connected to their home communities.
	5. Education Pathways and TCU Capacity	250 points	210	Lots of information. Figure B did not make sense. Feel like extra was included but it did not help their submission. Would like to have seen less buzzwords. Addressed everything. liked the community practice. Knowledge of the three types of CHAP is there. Did not have TCU specifics. Working on multiple pathways was understood. All CHAP info is there. but how will it be applied, functionality?
	6. BACB and Certification System Development	250 points	235	The offeror presents a governance framework with a structured approach and mentions a document library, but does not explain where it will be housed or who will manage it. They repeatedly reference lower CHAP implementation and demonstrate extensive CHAP knowledge, relying on the Portland Area Certification Board, which is relevant because Montana already has CHAP providers certified through that board. The visuals are a mix—some helpful, others unnecessary—and there are too many different frameworks. The list of deliverables is extensive but would benefit from clearer organization and justification.
	7. Shared Clinical, Education, and Certification Tools	250 points	220	The proposal provides extensive CHAP detail and lists multiple tools for each area but includes no timeline. It addresses all required elements and notes ADA accessibility, a Montana-owned resource library, and alignment with existing resources. However, it is unclear where the library would be housed or how it would be managed.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Mountain Quality Health Foundation				**4310**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	8. Workforce, Preceptor, and Supervisor Development	250 points	200	The response contains a lot of information but is still difficult to follow. Much of the work is described as something they *may* do rather than what they will commit to. They include numerous frameworks and models and show awareness of what is needed, but provide limited detail on how the work will actually be completed. While they address all required components and demonstrate understanding of how to strengthen pathways, the proposal lacks Montana-specific detail and presents a one-sided approach.
	9. Data, Reporting, and Continuous Quality Improvement	250 points	230	The response shows a strong understanding of data sovereignty and governance but does not specify what tools or systems will be used to track TA. They note a willingness to provide data training, and the primary company has relevant experience through its existing RHTP contracts. Their plan reflects solid capacity for data collection and management. They also provide a detailed approach for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and using data while respecting tribal governance, confidentiality, and local priorities.
	10. Learning Community and Knowledge Transfer	250 points	230	Thorough response, list of community guidelines and opportunities to bring CHAP together. Communities of practice. Need in person CHAP experience. Who is going to guide them. No Montana specifics mentioned. detailed approach for knowledge transfer. In person participation is key for CHAP and it is not shown in this category. All other pieces are covered. Long-term capacity building. Phased knowledge approach. Repository is housed and who will maintain it? clarity on sharing tribal resources with the tribes permission for replication.
	11. Project Timeline and Implementation Schedule	250 points	140	The response starts with a framework but only provides a timeline for the elements listed in the prompt. It does not address the additional required components, such as identifying responsible parties, detailing all activities and milestones, outlining dependencies and risks, or defining performance periods. The sustainability timeline also lacks sufficient detail to meet the full scope of work.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Mountain Quality Health Foundation				**4310**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	12. Proposal Timeline	250 points	230	Both the one-year detailed schedule and the five-year implementation schedule with the relevant pieces. Timeline is there. Did have supporting partners. Would like to have seen more for Montana. detailed one-year startup. Identified their lead. milestones.
Offeror Qualifications				
	References	300 points	230	The offeror provided the required information and included four Montana references, including one Tribal Health Department. However, none of the references are CHAP-specific. They followed instructions by using MPQ references and submitted more than the minimum, but they did not provide specific service dates. While all references reflect tribal work relevant to Montana, the services do not fully align with the scope requested.
	Company Profile and Experience	300 points	220	The proposal provides only basic information and shows no experience supporting CHAP implementation, including no Montana-specific CHAP experience. The primary staff member's background is administrative, though the position is full-time in Montana. All four staff listed have zero CHAP experience. The travel budget is under $10,000 per year. They claim DPHHS experience but do not specify the nature of that work.
	Resume	300 points	230	The offeror includes a resume with some CHAP experience and backgrounds in health policy, nursing, communications, and tribal engagement. They present significant tribal and tribal health experience overall, with one staff member having three years of relevant experience. ESI will perform most of the contracted work. The proposal does not account for staff traveling to Montana and shows very limited Montana-specific tribal experience. They did provide resumes for all staff, demonstrating general experience working with tribal communities.
STOP HERE				

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV

RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.

Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:
Nokomis Strategies			**3761**

Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section				
SECTION	**Technical Evaluation / Scope of Work**		**Score**	**Justification Notes**
Technical Scoring	1. Statewide Technical Assistance	300 points	180	The offeror shows foundational CHAP knowledge and notes relevant TA techniques. They propose a relationship with the Montana Urban Indian Health Association, which is a positive element, though they do not identify who would lead that work. Instead of a rapid-mobilization plan, they present a model they intend to use, relying heavily on MCUIH for TA. Deliverables are listed but lack detail and timeframes. Their hub-and-spoke model centers on early engagement, reviewing existing materials, and tracking requests across pillars, but overall the response provides only the minimum required information.
	2. Cross-Pillar Integration and Subject-Matter Expertise	300 points	180	Covered the basics of what was requested. Very general plan of cross pillar integration. Did not find past CHAP experience. With such general responses, I'm concerned that they don't possess the subject matter expertise to lead and coordinate this work. Still caught up on the division of roles. division of roles between a comas and Makui. And so, it's kind of noted there, but like there's a basic understanding and a Montana concepts. How will one person be able to be functional had responses - cross pillar coordination, dependency tracking, approval, risk management. MCUIH as central coordination raises concerns about unnecessary steps and barriers.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Nokomis Strategies				**3761**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	3. Tribal and THO Readiness Assessments	250 points	155	The offeror emphasizes direct coordination with tribal nations to listen, validate, and develop tribe-specific roadmaps. However, they do not describe the readiness tiers, and their reliance on MCUIH raises concerns about whether TA will be direct and easily accessible. The response is culturally grounded and acknowledges that tribes will be the employers of CHAP providers, incorporating listening, validation, practical planning, discussions, interviews, and workflow reviews. Deliverables lack dates, and the MCUIH program director has no CHAP experience. Overall, the section lacks the depth and culturally responsive detail expected from an entity with significant experience working with tribes.
	4. Clinical Integration	250 points	175	The offeror shows some understanding of the startup process and how CHAP could be integrated into existing tribal systems. They identify partners and acknowledge the need to build CHAP into current structures, including telehealth. However, they do not outline a specific CHAP pathway, name leads, or clarify who will do the work. Their continued reliance on MCUIH remains concerning, and the proposal lacks a clear, actionable plan for implementation.
	5. Education Pathways and TCU Capacity	250 points	180	The response shows some previous experience, but most of it centers on the lead having graduated from Salish Kootenai College, which does not equate to expertise in the Montana TCU system. Their answers are brief and do not fully address key questions, particularly regarding student recruitment, retention, and wraparound services. They mention all three CHAP pathways and provide a crosswalk, but the plan lacks detail on how they will support students or implement these pathways. Overall, the proposal demonstrates only foundational CHAP understanding and contains notable gaps.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Nokomis Strategies				**3761**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	6. BACB and Certification System Development	250 points	190	The response shows a foundational understanding of CHAP and mentions both the Area Certification Board and academic components. However, it relies heavily on MCUIH, which remains a concern, and does not include tribal representation for the Billings Area Certification Board. While all required components are covered and the section demonstrates overall understanding of how to develop a Billings-area certification board, it lacks dates and Montana-specific detail.
	7. Shared Clinical, Education, and Certification Tools	250 points	180	Details are there. Have electronic manuals. All essential components are here. Liked to have seen more functionality of who would do the work. the submission overall includes, you know, like a basic approach to developing and aligning tools. But I personally don't think it provides enough detail to understand how some of this work is going to be accomplished. has been developing shared resources for each workstream with statewide distribution while allowing local materials to stay controlled by the organization. Will work with relevant partners, including MCUIH Network and other designated clinic and tribal partners.
	8. Workforce, Preceptor, and Supervisor Development	250 points	185	Response provided at a basic level. Does not specify the work that is actually going to be done. Example: support clinical workforce retention - provided states that quote retention will be addressed as a system issue, but it doesn't actually specify what the TA vendor's going to do to support it. So, I noted this as a deficiency, and I brought my score down to fair. addressed statewide work development. Formed by readiness and then again relying on MCUIH for coordination causes concerns. And then I would have liked some more strategies to reduce barriers like. Strategies to reduce barriers but not expanded. all CHAP components were there. outlined student pathway. continues to separate out the work with just like here's what the one MCUIH program director will be doing.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Nokomis Strategies				**3761**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	9. Data, Reporting, and Continuous Quality Improvement	250 points	185	The offeror proposes developing a coordinated measurement system to track progress and outcomes, but their approach raises concerns. If tribes report issues through MCUIH, it could create confusion and potential conflicts with data sovereignty. They state they will work with DPHHS to define data collection methods, reporting schedules, and responsibilities, but keeping tribal data with MCUIH may be problematic. Overall, the submission lacks sufficient detail on how TA data and other implementation data will be collected, managed, and reported. They reference a quality-improvement framework, but the plan remains vague and incomplete.
	10. Learning Community and Knowledge Transfer	250 points	160	The response demonstrates foundational CHAP knowledge in Montana and references key groups such as Rocky Mountain Tribal Leaders, the Health Subcommittee, and American Indian health leadership meetings convened by the Montana Healthcare Foundation. However, the partnership between Nicomas and MCUIH remains concerning, particularly because long-term knowledge transfer to MCUIH could require tribes to negotiate separate agreements. The submission reflects a basic understanding of existing groups and ongoing state activities and includes a detailed long-term plan identifying tribal gatherings, peer exchanges, and collaboration. It also notes experience in capacity building, early implementation, and ongoing resource maintenance.
	11. Project Timeline and Implementation Schedule	250 points	190	The proposal includes most of the required elements but does not explain how the plan meets state requirements. While detailed and organized by roles, it lacks a clear strategy for knowledge transfer. They do not address work with TCUs, which is a missed opportunity and suggests limited understanding of TCU implementation needs.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Nokomis Strategies				**3761**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	12. Proposal Timeline	250 points	220	They included a year-one startup schedule with deliverables, responsible leads, and start and end dates. While all required components are present, the response lacks sufficient detail on TA activities. The requested year-one startup schedule with all proposed activities and deliverables was provided, but the TA information was incomplete.
Offeror Qualifications				
	References	300 points	200	The offeror listed three tribal references, but only one reflects TA experience, and none are CHAP-related. The service descriptions lacked detail and did not include CHAP or Montana-specific work. All references came from Tribal Health but do not demonstrate experience aligned with the scope of work.
	Company Profile and Experience	300 points	230	The offeror highlights experience working with Montana tribal populations and demonstrates staff knowledge of CHAP, though no CHAP-specific work is included in the submission. They note some Montana experience and have Alaska CHAP experience, but they lack TCU experience. The CEO's background mentions some past DPHHS work.
	Resume	300 points	220	The offeror lists key personnel, including Montana staff with experience in tribal health, tribal nations, and CHAP or CHAP-adjacent work. However, they do not identify who will serve as the MCUIH CHAP Director. While the team has substantial tribal experience, little of it is Montana-specific. They also did not identify who will play major roles or provide job descriptions, which should have been included, especially since some positions have not yet been hired.
STOP HERE				

DPHHS-RFP-2027-0700NAV				
RHTP - MONTANA COMMUNITY HEALTH AID PROGRAM (CHAP) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Wellness Equity Alliance				**FAILED**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section				
SECTION	**Technical Evaluation / Scope of Work**		**Score**	**Justification Notes - AFTER CONSENSUS DISCUSSION THIS VENDOR HAS FAILED AND WILL NOT BE SCORED ANY FURTHER**
Technical Scoring	1. Statewide Technical Assistance	300 points	FAILED	Knowhere in this section is culturally appropriate or doesn't even mention an exact timeline. No specific Montana info. Just a TA system. couldn't find anything in here that was like, oh, they know about chap. Not enough detail how this would be mobilized. lacking detail if they could do the work. Deliverables - basic list. Feels like the submission was built in AI - due to lacking info.
	2. Cross-Pillar Integration and Subject-Matter Expertise	300 points		
	3. Tribal and THO Readiness Assessments	250 points		
	4. Clinical Integration	250 points		
	5. Education Pathways and TCU Capacity	250 points		
	6. BACB and Certification System Development	250 points		
	7. Shared Clinical, Education, and Certification Tools	250 points		
	8. Workforce, Preceptor, and Supervisor Development	250 points		
	9. Data, Reporting, and Continuous Quality Improvement	250 points		
	10. Learning Community and Knowledge Transfer	250 points		
	11. Project Timeline and Implementation Schedule	250 points		
	12. Proposal Timeline	250 points		
Offeror Qualifications				
	References	300 points		

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 5000 points. The Technical Scoring, Offeror Qualifications and Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide.				
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:
Wellness Equity Alliance				**FAILED**
Category		**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
	Company Profile and Experience	300 points		
	Resume	300 points		
STOP HERE				