

1. The State is allowing less than three-and-a-half weeks to develop a response. Would the State consider extending the deadline to April 13, 2012?

No, extending the deadline will delay the State's vendor/contract approval process for another 30 days and work could not commence until June versus May as currently predicted.

2. Please identify the stakeholders (individuals and groups) currently in place for which the State expects the vendor to engage in the process. Please describe the efforts to date in which these stakeholders have been engaged, relative to Money Follows the Person (MFP).

The potential opportunities provided by MFP have been discussed and explored throughout the State since its original solicitation, most recently in mid-year 2010. We have existing stakeholder relationships with other State Agencies, advocates, recipients, family members, and related association members.

3. What would be the expected level of effort (in number of meetings/locations, etc.) from the vendor regarding the stakeholder engagement (an essential part of the operational protocol development), including stakeholder structure establishment (committee formations, solicitation for participation, etc), on-site meetings, facilitation and follow up?

The expected level of effort would be a sufficient number of meetings to engage stakeholders to a level that the operational protocol will best meet the needs of the State. We budgeted for a minimum of 12 meetings over the 12 month Planning Grant Period. Available agency staff is limited, the vendor would be expected to contribute considerable effort in accomplishing meeting agendas and follow up.

4. The solicitation notes that the vendor will "develop existing stakeholder partnerships." Could the State provide some baseline information on the foundation of stakeholder partnerships that are currently utilized by the State?

The potential opportunities provided by MFP have been discussed and explored throughout the State since its original solicitation, most recently in mid-year 2010. We have existing stakeholder relationships with other State Agencies, advocates, recipients, family members, and related association members.

5. Does the State have staff dedicated to support this effort able to provide data and information regarding the current capacity for the provision of home and community-based services (HCBS), the identification of barriers to community integration, knowledge of institutional utilization patterns and other information that will be important to both identify the current challenges and opportunities that MFP will provide? If yes, please identify the level and number of these staff.

There will not be extensive data/information support staff dedicated to this effort. Basic data about HCBS will be available based on current utilization and claims history.

6. The solicitation notes that the development of the draft Operational Protocol (OP) includes a number of long-term structural improvement efforts, including eliminating barriers or mechanisms, whether in the State law, the State Medicaid Plan, the State budget, or otherwise, that prevent or restrict the flexible use of Medicaid funds to enable Medicaid-eligible individuals to receive support for appropriate and necessary long-term services in the settings of their choice. Because these items are likely to exceed the terms of the agreement and may require significant effort within the State, is the obligation for this solicitation the identification of such barriers and identification of potential strategies for the State's consideration to mitigate them? If yes, does the State intend to negotiate the scope separate from the deliverables identified in the RFP but under the same contract?

Identification of barriers and mitigation should be addressed in the OP. There is no anticipation of a separate scope to be negotiated.

7. Item VII(E) indicates that additions or exceptions to the standard terms and conditions are not allowed, but item IX(D) indicates that amendments are recognized if in writing. Will additional terms or revisions, such as a limitation of liability, be considered if agreed to by both parties? Will vendors be penalized or their proposal be judged non-responsive by including exceptions to the terms and conditions?

Item IX(D) refers to amendments to the contract during the term of the contract, such as modification to the scope of work. Item VII(E) is referring to the proposals submitted during the procurement process. Bidders must accept the Standard Terms & Conditions contained in the RFP and any amendments thereto. Any bids that are not compliant will be rejected.

8. Section III. Pricing, last sentence, states "Invoicing will be allowed on a monthly basis" but Section VI. Corporate Background and References, 2.e. requires the proposer to acknowledge that "the State will not reimburse the Contractor until ... (2) the Agency has received and approved all deliverables covered by the invoice". We are unclear whether or not this combination of provisions allows for monthly progress billing and payments or if payments are based only on accepted deliverables identified in Appendix B. We are also unclear as to how quickly we might reasonably expect deliverables to be approved.

Reimbursement will not be made until the deliverable is received and approved. Monthly progress billing will not be considered. The Agency is committed to reviewing and approving deliverables in a timely manner. It is expected that the Agency will review multiple drafts of the deliverables prior to final submission, thereby minimizing the approval time.