



MARTIN O'MALLEY
Governor

ANTHONY BROWN
Lieutenant Governor

T. ELOISE FOSTER
Secretary

DAVID C. ROMANS
Deputy Secretary

**Q & A #4
to
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
DPSCS INMATE MEDICAL HEALTH CARE AND UTILIZATION SERVICES
SOLICITATION NUMBER DPSCS Q0012013**

NOVEMBER 15, 2011

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following questions, for the above referenced RFP, were received by e-mail and are being answered and posted for all Offerors. The numerical sequencing begins with question #319; questions #1 through #4 were answered in Q&A #1, issued on July 21, 2011, questions #5 through #276 were answered in Q&A #2, issued on November 4, 2011, and questions #277 through #318 were answered in Q&A #3, issued on November 12, 2011:

319. Question: As of the date of submission for this question, there are 9 business days remaining until the due date for proposals, including the proposal due date. Additionally, answers to questions remain outstanding. It is necessary to begin proposal publishing and shipping prior to the Thanksgiving and American Indian Heritage holidays in order to ensure receipt by the Department on the current due date. This scenario leaves no more than five business days to review the remaining answers to questions and incorporate those answers into proposal and pricing content. Will the Department please extend the proposal due date for a period of time more amenable to the production of a quality proposal that thoroughly considers all remaining information and answers to questions in order to provide the best value proposal to the Department?

Answer: See Amendment #6, items 1 and 2, which change the proposal due date to December 13, 2011 in the Key Information Summary Sheet and section 1.10.

320. Question: In order to ensure that MBE participation is offered/selected to best meet the needs of the Department and its inmate patients, will the Department please modify the Minority Business Enterprise Participation requirements to allow for a prime contractor to make a binding commitment to an appropriately certified MBE percentage of participation without identifying the MBE partner within the prime contractor's proposal?

Answer: The Maryland MBE program is governed by law and regulation and DPSCS does not have the authority to grant what is being requested. As instructed in

~Effective Resource Management~

45 Calvert Street • Annapolis, MD 21401-1907

Tel: (410) 260-7374 • Fax: (410) 974-3274 • Toll Free: 1 (800) 705-3493 • TTY Users: call via Maryland Relay
<http://www.dbm.maryland.gov> • alockett@dbm.state.md.us

Attachment D, each Offeror must identify in its technical proposal on the D-1 form: 1. the specific MBE(s) that will be used if the Offeror is awarded the contract; 2. the contract related activity (ies) for which each MBE will be used; and, 3. the percentage of the contract value (less off-site secondary care and optional services) to which the Offeror commits to make a good faith effort to use each MBE for the described contract related activity (ies).

321. Question: In order to ensure that MBE participation is offered/selected to best meet the needs of the Department and its inmate patients, will the Department please allow a waiver period of up to six months from the contract start date for the full implementation and participation of an MBE partner/partners to meet the required commitment level for MBE participation?

Answer: If the intent of the question is to inquire whether a MBE that is identified in an Offeror's technical proposal on the D-1 form might be used for activities that won't start until up to 6 months after performance of the contract begins, the answer is yes. If the intent is the same as in question 2, for an Offeror to be permitted to not identify one or more MBEs in its technical proposal on the D-1 form, but identify it/them up to 6 months from the contract start date, the answer is no.

322. Question: RFP Page 42, 3.6.1.2: Attachment R – BCCC – Attachment R indicates a .2 LPN 7 days per week, however, the FTE indicates a .25. Is it the intent of the Department to staff a .25 LPN or a .35 LPN which represents a .2 for 7 days a week?

Answer: Neither. .2 LPN, 7 days a week actually equates to .28 FTE. (**1.6 hours a day x 7 days = 11.2 hours a week / 40 hours = .28 FTE**). See Amendment #6, item 3, which references a newly revised Attachment R reflecting this FTE correction.

323. Question: Attachment R – Baltimore JI: Attachment R indicates 2 Discharge Planning nurses. Is this in addition to the 7 Discharge Planning Nurses in the RFP narrative (1-Baltimore Sentenced, 1-Baltimore Pre-Trial, 2-Jessup, 1-Eastern, 1-Hagerstown, and 1-Cumberland)?

Answer: Only 7 total release/discharge planning nurses are required by section 3.41.4.1. Offerors may propose more than, but not less than this number. (See Amendment #4, item 36). See also Amendment #6, item 3, which deletes two of the Release/Discharge Planning Nursing positions in the Baltimore region.

324. Question: Attachment R – Cumberland: Attachment R does not indicate a Discharge Planning nurse. Is it the intent of the Department to require a Discharge Planning nurse in Cumberland as indicated in the RFP narrative?

Answer: RFP section 3.41.4.1 (as revised in Amendment #4, item 36) specifies there shall be 2 release/discharge planning nurses in the Western SDA, one of which is to be located in Cumberland. As per Amendment #5, item 19, a new caveat was added to RFP section 4.4 Tab D, 1.6 that says that Offerors must provide all positions specifically identified in section 3 of the RFP. In addition, see Amendment #6, item 3,

which includes a revised Attachment R which indicates 2 release/discharge planning nurses are required for the Western SDA, one of which is to be in Cumberland.

325. Question: Attachment R – Jessup: Attachment R indicates 2 Discharge Planning nurses for each day, however, the final FTE is 1.0. Is it the intent of the Department to require 2 Discharge Planning nurses in Jessup?

Answer: RFP section 3.41.4.1 specifies there shall be 2 release/discharge planning nurses in the Jessup SDA. As per Amendment #5, item 19, a new caveat was added to RFP section 4.4 Tab D, 1.6 that says that Offerors must provide all positions specifically identified in section 3 of the RFP. In addition, see Amendment #6, item 3, which includes a revised Attachment R which indicates 2 FTEs for the Jessup SDA release/discharge planning nurses.

326. Question: RFP page 23, Section 1.10 and page 182, Section 4.5: In Section 1.10 the Department is requesting one electronic CD of the Financial Proposal; however, in Section 4.5, the requirement is for two copies of the electronic CD for the Financial Proposal. Please clarify the number of CDs to be submitted for the Financial Proposal.

Answer: Please see Amendment #6, item 2, revising section 1.10 to require 2 electronic CDs of the financial proposal in MS Excel.

327. Question: Amendment 3, Section 3.58.3 – Please clarify the implementation date for the Pre-Trial Violence Reduction Program. Is it within 40 days of contract commencement or as of the Go Live Date?

Answer: As per RFP section 3.58.3 a draft Pre-Trial Violence Reduction Program is to be provided within 40 days of Contract Commencement (See section 1.4.1). An additional 15 days are allowed for the Contractor to receive and implement comments regarding its draft Program. Upon incorporation of all Department comments to its draft, the Program will be ready to be implemented. The Program must then be implemented as of the Go Live Date.

328. Question: Q&A # 2, page 2, Number 92: Please confirm that the medical vendor will be responsible for Factor VIII & IX rather than the pharmacy vendor.

Answer: Question #92 (issued November 4, 2011) was responded to incorrectly in including clotting factors as a cost to the (medical) contractor. The (medical) contractor is not responsible for purchasing medications that treat clotting deficiencies like factors 8, 9 and 5. The Pharmacy contractor is expected to provide these medications.

329. Question: Q&A # 2, page 2, Number 117: Will the Department conditionally accept the optional digital x-ray system allowing a thorough analysis of needed alterations post contract award upon which the Department would make a final decision?

Answer: Yes. It is permissible for an Offeror to state in its technical proposal that it is unable to identify needed alterations that DPSCS must undertake to accommodate

the Offeror's proposed digital x-ray system unless and until DPSCS elects to exercise the option for the Contractor to install its proposed system.

Should you require clarification of the information provided, please contact me at (410) 260-7374 as soon as possible.

Date Issued: **November 15, 2011**

By: Andrea R. Lockett
<signed>
Procurement Officer