

1. **Question:** Due to the six day delay in responding to Bidders' questions, (possibly a result of the number of submitted questions and requested detail provided by the Department) will the Department reconsider a one to two week extension of the Proposal due date to allow potential bidders to review the answers to questions and fully integrate the Department's answers into submitted proposals.

Response: The Proposal Due Date has been **extended to Tuesday, July 19, 3 PM Local Time.**

2. **Question:** Will the Department confirm if the daily eligibility file will be an 837 file or a proprietary batch file?

Response: The Department believes that the bidder intended to reference an 834 file, not an 837 file. At this time the Department believes the file will be a proprietary file rather than an 834.

3. **Question:** One last question. On page 130 I, #2,a & b appear to be the same document based on what you forwarded earlier. Can you clarify?

Response: Yes, you are correct. They are the same document. The RFP has been amended to reflect a correction.

4. **Question:** Since questions have just been released I was wondering if there had been any consideration for extending the proposal due date?

Response: The Proposal Due Date has been **extended to Tuesday, July 19, 3 PM Local Time.**

5. **Question:** For the performance bond, will the State accept one year renewable bonds?

Response: The performance bond may be one year renewable but there may never be a lapse in coverage for the duration of the contract.

6. **Question:** In the original proposal, the Department provided call center statistics for the FFS population with a promise to release call statistics for the remaining Medicaid programs. The answer to question 25 indicates that no additional data will be included in the RFP. Publishing the data for FFS gives an unfair advantage to some of the incumbents who currently do MCO and LIA work. They now have the advantage of knowing total State data for the FFS population along with their own data for the populations they serve. Considering that call center staffing is driven by call volumes, and is key to a successful ASO proposal, how does the State plan to address this inequity and to level the playing field for all bidders?

Response: To ensure that each potential Bidder for this RFP has the same access to the call volume data that is in the Department's possession, we are releasing the call

volume data for the populations to be served through this resultant contract. As you will see, the call volume statistics for the non-fee-for-service population vary greatly. In the opinion of the Department, such variances may be attributable to the lack of a standard business model to operate a call center. In addition, as the data has not been audited, the integrity of the data has not been validated. It was for these reasons that the Department originally elected to retract any call center data.

Although we are releasing this data, the Department's position remains that **potential bidders should not use call volume data in the development and submission of its response to the NEMT RFP**. As stated in Addendum 2, any and all potential bidders shall use the trip utilization data and the population data provided and analyze that data in the context of its individual call center methodology. If the bidder makes certain assumptions related to the call volume in the development of its response then its response should disclose the assumptions including how the assumptions were developed through the use of the trip utilization and population data provided. **Potential bidders should not use call volume data of any kind in its methodology or cost proposal.**

7. **Question:** After review of addendum four response to questions; I was hoping that you could provide one additional point of clarity. In the proposal page 42, section 1.4 Proposer References – Organization it implies that you want contact information for three references, which you will contact as part of the proposal review process. However, on question 44 of addendum four it implies that we should include reference letters. Would you clarify for me whether we should include the contact information for the three references or if you want the letters include with our submission.

Additionally, I was wondering if you had a chance to review my email dated June 28, requesting consideration of an extension?

Response: Response to Question 44 is amended as follows: Current NEMT brokers are not required to submit a reference from the Department, but they are welcome to do so. Anyone that provides a reference here at DSS has signed a confidentiality form regarding the RFP and they may not discuss anything about the RFP, other than the necessary requirements of the reference. Since they are not discussing the RFP, they are not violating the principle of the issuing office. Please provide the contact information for the three references, not letters of reference.

The Proposal Due date has been **extended to Tuesday, July 19, 3:00 PM Local Time.**