

**Michael Fischer
Interim City
Administrator**

**Jere Wood
Mayor**

ADDENDUM 1

City of Roswell Purchasing Division

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #17-306-E

October 24, 2017

To All Prospective Offerors:

The date for posting the addendum has been extended to Tuesday, October 24, 2017

The due date has been changed from Thursday, November 2, 2017 2:00 p.m. to Thursday, November 9, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

The dates of the oral presentations have been extended from Wednesday, November 15, 2017 to November 29 & November 30, 2017

In reference to the RFP listed above, the following answers to questions, additions, deletions and changes are hereby incorporated into the Request for Proposal:

1. On page 7, under 1.4.1 Organization of Proposal, paragraph 2 references "Section 3.1 Scope of Project/Specifications". Should it actually reference Section 3.3 (Scope of Work) or Section 4 (Proposal Requirements)?

Answer: Subsection 1.4.1 Subheading 2 should read as follows:

Section 3, Scope of Project/Specifications – Offeror shall respond comprehensively and clearly to the requirements of Section 3.3 and include all documents, information, exceptions, clarifications, etc., as requested therein. Vendors should provide their tactic to performance of that scope of work by responding to corresponding questions in Section 4. Number the responses to so they are keyed to the paragraph of the RFP that the response address. If the Offeror cross-references supplemental materials as enclosures or appendices or annexes to the proposal, be sure that this information is numbered in the supplemental materials showing exactly what the paragraph in the RFP the supplemental material is addressing.

2. On page 22, under 5.1.1 Technical Proposal Requirements, there is a list of the required proposal section titles. Section 4 isn't broken out into different sections, and I'm not sure which questions are supposed to be provided under each heading. I believe it should be as follows, but please verify:

Answer: Section 4 is the ability of the vendor to be responsible. By answering and completing the information, being asked sequentially in the section the participating vendor would have complied with providing the necessary information. This is reiterated in section 1.4.1 "number the responses so they are keyed to the paragraph of the RFP that the response addresses". You can disregard the last sentence in section 5.1.1.

3. On page 7, paragraph 6 states the Technical Proposal must not include any cost figures. On Appendix G – Consultant Questionnaire, questions 16 & 17 specifically ask for the cost of services reference in those questions. Is Appendix G exempt from the requirement noted on page 7, or should the pricing only be noted in the Cost Proposal?

Answer: The pricing for items asked in questions 16&17 should be addressed in the cost proposal

4. On page 18, question 4 states "Indicate areas of development services in which the Consultant is qualified as it relates to the Roswell Project". Photographs of completed projects are also requested. It doesn't seem as though that question is truly applicable to the services requested in the RFP. Was this question included in error?

Answer: That question is an error it can be omitted.

5. Should our response to question 11 – Cost and Fees (page 21) be included in the separate envelope with Appendix B – Cost Proposal and Special Project Rates?

Answer: Yes, as is designates that "Appendix B is for the "Cost Proposal and Special Project Rates"

6. Can we provide our responses to Appendix G – Consultant Questionnaire in our own format, as long as it is clearly labeled as Appendix G?

Answer: You can so long as it addresses the questions that are being asked.

7. When was the last employee dependent audit done?

Answer: It was last completed in 2009.

8. How long has the current Consultant/Broker been handling your case?

Answer: 5 years.

9. Is the City/BOC willing to change within 60 days or sooner after the approval of change?

Answer: The awarded vendor would start February 2018.

10. What hasn't been going well with the current service(s)?

Answer: Not applicable.

11. What has been going well?

Answer: Expertise and knowledge; customer service; response time to our needs.

12. What has been done to implement the HB146 law, starting January 1, 2018? Beyond talking with ACCG, if you're City/BOC are members.

Answer: Not directly related to this RFP. However, GMA is giving us a quote and our current consultant has already given us valuable information.

13. What is the current coverage/percentage amount spend the city pays in premiums for your employees?

Answer: Assuming this is for the medical, cost share for employee only is 90/10 and with dependents 85/15.

14. What has been the increase(s) percentage, for the past 3 years, of your medical plan absorbed by the City/BOC?

Answer: Nominal, due to self-funded, City management philosophy and merit budgeted (or not).

15. Regarding the policies, supplemental/workplace products, that are active, how long are their rates guaranteed?

Answer: Varies (1 plus years, depending on the product).

16. If there are questions not answered or don't have outlined experience requested, how much does that affect next step opportunity?

Answer: Please see Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the RFP.

17. Confirm whether there are any union/bargained groups. If yes, please describe the expectations of the consulting firm regarding services related to these groups. For example, will the consulting firm be expected to prepare additional financial proposals related to union negotiations?

Answer: Not Applicable

18. Please provide a new hire guide and/or enrollment guide that provides more details on current offerings.

Answer: <http://www.roswellatwork.com/home/showdocument?id=4930>

19. Describe rate/contribution setting and approval process. How many scenarios typically get presented before a strategy is adopted.

Answer: This is reviewed each year. Last year we aimed for a 90/10 cost share for employee only and 85/15 for dependent coverage on the medical. Many factors are involved (budget, claims experience, merit). Several scenarios are reviewed before one is approved.

20. Has the City evaluated or given considerations to a private exchange?

Answer: Yes

21. What benefit administration platform or vendor does the City currently utilize? Will the consulting partner be expected to provide a benefit administration platform? Or will the consulting partner simply provide support in configuration of the system?

Answer: Munis – internal financial software package. There is interest in researching outside software programs.

22. Describe in greater detail the expectations of the consulting partner related to day to day consultation on plan interpretation and problem resolution. Will the consulting partner be expected to field employee questions directly or will the partner manage escalated situations only?

Answer: Day to day contact is with Human Resources via the Benefits Manager, for administration aspects of the plans, as well as complex situations. Employees receive help mainly from the insurance companies, Human Resources and the consultants' benefit advocate service.

23. Describe in greater detail the expectations of the consulting partner related to acting as an advocate or ombudsman in appeal, arbitration or court process between the City and the providers on unresolved issues if needed.

Answer: We expect the consultant to be involved as a professional expert for the City, if this were to happen.

24. Describe in greater detail the expectations of the consulting partner to attend annual enrollment meetings and other new hire meetings. Will the consulting partner be expected to conduct 12 – 15 meetings or simply be in attendance? What level of support does the City receive from carriers and vendors in support of the meeting?

Answer: This varies. With no carrier changes, the annual open enrollment meetings are 7 or 8. With carrier changes, we try to coordinate a carrier representative to attend each meeting. Someone from the consultant firm is at every meeting, to answer questions, fill in if a carrier representative is not able to attend and conduct / explain various benefits (medical, dental, vision, life and disability).

25. Will the City rely on the consulting partner to develop enrollment and communications materials including themes, layout, and content? Or will the consulting partner simply review and edit materials?

Answer: Both. This is a collaboration, but most of this process is handled by the consultant, with the City reviewing the material, supplying some artwork, and providing the premium cost share info.

26. Describe in detail the expectations of the consulting partner regarding the development and assistance related to employee and satisfaction surveys. How many surveys per year does the

City anticipate conducting? Will the consulting partner be expected to develop and provide a platform for administering the survey or simply provide suggested questions and methodology?

Answer: We may do a few surveys per year, which are done in-house. Assistance and input might be needed from the consultant, based on topic matter and their experience and input with other employers.

27. Has the City of Roswell agreed to include a limitation of liability in the resulting contract? If not would you be willing to submit a waiver before the proposal due date?

Answer: Any limit of liability must meet the minimum insurance requirements.

28. Whom does the decision evaluation committee consist of?

Answer: The committee consist of members from our Administration, Finance and Recreation & Parks department.

29. Why has the city issued the RFP?

Answer: The contract with our existing vendor is ending.

30. How many vendors received the RFP?

Answer: The total number of vendors that received notification of this proposal is 636.

31. Is the City willing to discuss modifications to the Terms and Conditions following the award of a Contract?

Answer: No

32. Would the City be willing to include a termination for cause right for Contractor upon an uncured material breach of the Contract by the City?

Answer: No

33. Is the City willing to modify Section 7.7(A) to reflect that Contractor will indemnify, defend and save harmless the City against any third party claim to the extent directly arising out of Contractor's negligent acts or omissions or bad faith conduct in connection with Contractor's performance of its obligations under this contract?

Answer: No

34. Contractor believes that it should have no responsibility for any losses, liabilities or damages to the extent they are attributable to the acts or omissions of an indemnified person or any third party other than Contractor's subcontractors. Is the City willing to include such a provision in the Contract?

Answer: No

35. Due to confidentiality concerns, copies of insurance policies cannot be provided. Is the City willing to remove this requirement?

Answer: No

36. Is the City willing to modify this provision to that that Contractor will endeavor to provide the City with 30 days' notice prior to any termination, cancellation or material change to the required policies?

Answer: No

37. Contractor's Professional Liability coverage is provided on a "per claim" basis. Is the City willing to make this change to the Terms and Conditions?

Answer: No

38. Is the City willing to include a limitation of Contractor's liability in the Contract? Contractor's standard limitation of liability is one times the compensation for the Services giving rise to such loss.

Answer: No

39. Is the City willing to add language such as the following, "In no event shall either party be liable in connection with the contract for loss of profits or any indirect, incidental, punitive, special or consequential damages arising in any manner from the contract regardless of foreseeability thereof."

Answer: No

40. Is the City willing to add reciprocal confidentiality obligations to the contract?

Answer: No

41. Is the City willing to add an ownership of deliverables provision to the contract as follows:
Deliverables created or developed by Contractor specifically and exclusively for the City pursuant to the Agreement shall be considered 'work made for hire' and exclusively owned by the City (collectively, "Work").

Answer: No

42. Is the City willing to add a "provision of information and assistance" clause to the Contract?

Answer: No

43. Is the City willing to add a no third party beneficiaries provision to the Contract?

Answer: No

44. Is the City willing to add a severability provision to the Contract?

Answer: No

45. Is the City willing to add an arbitration provision to the Contract?

Answer: No

46. **Who is the vendor for the employee clinic**

Answer: Healthstat

47. Why is the employee clinic being mentioned? Does the broker have to manage or coordinate anything with this service?

Answer: The City works directly with Healthstat, so there would be no direct interaction with the vendor. However, there are claims, data and helpful info that ties in with the medical claims data and experience.

48. Who is our current broker / consultant?

Answer: OneDigital

COMPLETE THIS ADDENDUM, SIGN and SUBMIT with the ITB to:

**City of Roswell – Purchasing Division
Roswell City Hall
38 Hill Street, Suite 130
Roswell, GA 30075**

I hereby acknowledge receipt of Addendum 1 and have incorporated the changes into my proposal response for the above mentioned RFP.

COMPANY NAME: _____ CONTACT PERSON: _____

ADDRESS: _____ CITY: _____ STATE: ____ ZIP: ____

PHONE: _____ FAX: _____ EMAIL ADDRESS: _____

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

