

STATE COMMISSION ON THE EFFICACY OF THE CON PROGRAM

Twin Towers Building/200 Piedmont Avenue
20th Floor, West Tower, Floyd Room
Atlanta, Georgia

June 12, 2006; 11:00am – 1:00pm
(Meeting held in Closed Executive Session)

Daniel W. Rahn, MD, Chair, Presiding

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeff Anderson
Senator Don Balfour
Melvin Deese, MD
Donna Johnson, Esq.
Robert Lipson, MD
Dan Maddock
Rhonda Meadows, MD
Ronnie Rollins
Joseph “Rusty” Ross, Esq.
Representative Austin Scott

STAFF PRESENT

Robyn Bussey
Quintin Gibbs
Charemon Grant, JD
Richard Greene, JD
Matthew Jarrard, MPA
Robert Rozier, JD
Rhathelia Stroud, JD
Stephanie Taylor, MPS

DEPT. OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (DOAS)
Gary Powell

WELCOME

Dr. Daniel Rahn called the closed session to order and welcomed Commission members, DCH staff, and staff from the Dept. of Administrative Services (DOAS). He briefly explained the purpose of the closed session meeting which is to review technical proposals submitted by two vendors, Navigant Consulting and the Georgia Health Policy Center. The successful applicant would provide data support to the CON Commission.

OVERVIEW OF CONSENSUS EVALUATION PROCESS

Rob Rozier provided an overview of the evaluation process which the Commission would use to select a data services vendor. He explained each phase of the evaluation process as follows:

- Phase 1 – Evaluation of Mandatory Requirements of Technical Proposals
- Phase 2 – Support Staff Review of Technical Proposals
- Phase 3 – Commission Member Evaluation of Proposals
- Phase 4 – Presentation by Proposers
- Phase 5 – Re-Consideration of Proposals
- Phase 6 – Evaluation of Cost Proposals
- Phase 7 – Ranking of Proposals

He also explained the scoring component of the evaluation process by reviewing each category of the RFP and its corresponding point value. Each Commission member was provided with score sheets for each vendor which outlined each phase of the evaluation process including specific questions that were to be considered in the calculation of each section of the proposal.

Prior to the scoring of the proposals Quintin Gibbs, DCH Procurement Office collected fully executed attestations from members of the Commission. The attestations acknowledged that members had no personal interest in any of the proposals and that they could review the Requests For Proposals (RFPs) within the established Evaluation Committee Rules.

SUMMARY/COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS AND TECHNICAL PROPOSAL CONSENSUS EVALUATION

Richard Greene presented the Commission with a limited comparative summary of each vendor's proposal. He explained that this summary should not to be used by the members as the single source to make final decision about the RFPs. The comparative summary included relevant information from each section of the proposals and provided references to particular sections of the proposals for additional information about that

vendor's qualifications and/or experience in each evaluation category. Commission members evaluated and scored each category of the RFP.

SUMMARY OF REFERENCE CHECKS

Stephanie Taylor reviewed the results of the reference checks that she conducted for each vendor. She noted that she called each of the three references provided by each vendor. She indicated that each reference was asked the same series of questions and was asked to assign a score between 0-4 for each of six questions, relating to the following: Timeliness of Project, Level of Satisfaction with Deliverables, Adequacy of Staffing for Project, Future Engagement Opportunities, Major Issues during Engagement, and Recommended areas to change prior to future engagements. Ms. Taylor said that she reached two of three references for the Georgia Health Policy Center, one of whom chose not to offer a score for each question, as requested. The final score for Georgia Health Policy Center is reflective of one reference. With regard to Navigant Consulting, Ms. Taylor reached all of the references; one reference chose not to offer a score. The final score for Navigant Consulting is reflective of two references. She noted that the final score for each applicant, in each category, is an average of the score/s that was reported by each reference.

INITIAL TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING/EVALUATION RESULTS

After each Commission member submitted the score sheets for each vendor, Matt Jarrard, Rob Rozier, and Quintin Gibbs tabulated the scores. Matt Jarrard compiled the scores into a spreadsheet and Rob Rozier presented the results to the Commission. Preliminary evaluation results of the technical proposal showed the Georgia Health Policy Center (GHPC) having the highest number of points. A motion to accept the initial technical proposal score was made by Melvin Deese, MD and seconded by Rhonda Medows, MD. The motion was unanimously accepted and approved by the Commission.

PRESENTATIONS FROM CONSULTANTS

Henry Miller, Ph.D., and Kathleen Schneider, RN, presented on behalf of Navigant Consulting and William Custer, Ph.D., and Patricia Ketsche presented on behalf of the Georgia Health Policy Center. Each presentation lasted approximately ten minutes after which the presenters fielded questions from Commission members. Consultants departed the room following their presentations.

FINAL TECHNICAL SCORING ANALYSIS

After the presentations from Consultants, Rob Rozier asked the Commission whether they wanted to re-evaluate any scoring category for either vendor in order to adjust the final scores. He cautioned members that, in accordance with state procurement processes, scores could only be reduced not increased. The Commission made no changes to earlier scores. A motion to accept the scores as they were presented was made by Melvin Deese, MD and seconded by Ronnie Rollins. The motion was unanimously accepted and approved by the Commission.

RELEASE OF COST PROPOSALS

Gary Powell of the Department of Administrative Services/Division of the Purchasing presented the Commission with each vendor's financial proposals. Commission members reviewed each financial proposal and asked questions of Mr. Powell and Quintin Gibbs.

FINAL SCORING RESULTS

Dr. Rahn reported that, based on the scores of the technical proposal and the cost proposal, it was the consensus of the Commission to award the Georgia Health Policy Center with the contract to provide data services to the Commission. A motion to make the offer to GHPC was made by Jeff Anderson and seconded by Donna Johnson. The motion was unanimously accepted and approved by the Commission. Dr. Rahn confirmed the results of the Commission's vendor selection would not be announced to the public until after the contract was signed by the vendor in accordance with state procurement laws.

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn the closed session was made by Senator Don Balfour, seconded by Jeff Anderson.

Minutes taken on behalf of Chair by Robyn Bussey.

Respectfully Submitted,

Daniel W. Rahn, MD
Chair