

Solicitation Amendment

SEBB Program Fully Insured Medical Plans

RFP No. 2716

Amendment No. 6

Date Issued: July 23, 2018

Purpose: Round 2 Questions and Answers - Continued

Amendment need not be submitted with Proposal. All other Terms, Conditions, and Specifications remain unchanged. The above referenced solicitation is amended as follows:

The following are the questions and answers from the *Round 2 Questions* period that required further research or have a clarification based on the new answers provided.

The rest of this page is intentionally left blank.

#	Section	Bidder Questions	HCA Answers
30	Exhibit I Section 1 Item i	We will need a census to complete Appendix 5. Please provide.	<p>[Appendix 5 is no longer a requirement as noted in questions 45, 46, 48 and 49. However, Bidders can still request the census data discussed in the answer already provided below by way of the NDA should they choose.]</p> <p>Currently HCA only has some of this data (which is either publicly available, or received by way of the Washington K-12 Legislated Data request) provided by two different sources: the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) F275 report accessed by HCA in December 2017 and Carrier claims data received on or around April 30, 2018. That being said, HCA will provide the aggregated data we have received to vendors who return a signed Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) to the RFP Coordinator. This NDA will be included as updated Appendix 5 to subsequent amendment 7.</p> <p>The different data sets available at this time that HCA can share were pulled at different times and based off of the different sets of data received: 1) enrollment counts by zip code for Subscribers and Dependents for 2016-2017 (Carrier claims data) and 2) year of birth and gender data (OSPI report).</p> <p>Please note that the data provided is aggregate data received by the Health Care Authority (HCA), and does not encompass a complete picture of the populations to be served under this RFP. The data is subject to change by HCA after the Apparently Successful Bidder(s) are announced, based on then-current data. Bidders are advised that they should rely upon their own experts and their own sources when responding to this RFP. HCA is not liable in any way to any bidder with respect to the data conveyed by HCA to the bidders under this RFP.</p>
45	Appendix 5	What do you want us to fill-in for urban & rural standards columns? In the % of members within standard column, are you looking for us to put current membership or estimate # of SEBB members within the standard?	<p>In a subsequent amendment to be released soon, the following adjustments will be made:</p> <p>(1) Exhibit I - Provider Network, section 1, item i will be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>[Mandatory not Scored] Network adequacy, by providing the network adequacy filings the Bidder submits to Washington, Idaho, and/or Oregon, whichever states the Bidder intends to offer a Service Area in for the SEBB Program. For each state, Bidder must attest whether or not they meet the state network adequacy standards.</p> <p>(2) Appendix 5, Provider Network Adequacy, will be deleted.</p>

46	Appendix 5	<p>The RFP requires that we meet the OIC's network requirements as outlined in WAC 284-170 but Appendix 5 (Provider Network Adequacy) does not align with those reporting requirements. Similarly, Appendix 5 states we must maintain a provider network as required by Oregon State law but the table does not align with Oregon DFR requirements. We can supply the network adequacy filings that we submit to Oregon and Washington, as required by each State. Will that suffice for this bid process?</p>	<p>Yes. In a subsequent amendment to be released soon, the following adjustments will be made:</p> <p>(1) Exhibit I - Provider Network, section 1, item i will be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>[Mandatory not Scored] Network adequacy, by providing the network adequacy filings the Bidder submits to Washington, Idaho, and/or Oregon, whichever states the Bidder intends to offer a Service Area in for the SEBB Program. For each state, Bidder must attest whether or not they meet the state network adequacy standards.</p> <p>(2) Appendix 5, Provider Network Adequacy, will be deleted.</p>
47	Appendix 5	<p>Please provide a census with member zip codes in order to complete Appendix 5.</p>	<p>[Appendix 5 is no longer a requirement as noted in questions 45, 46, 48 and 49. However, Bidders can still request the census data discussed in the answer already provided below by way of the NDA should they choose.]</p> <p>Currently HCA only has some of this data (which is either publicly available, or received by way of the Washington K-12 Legislated Data request) provided by two different sources: the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) F275 report accessed by HCA in December 2017 and Carrier claims data received on or around April 30, 2018. That being said, HCA will provide the aggregated data we have received to vendors who return a signed Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) to the RFP Coordinator. This NDA will be included as updated Appendix 5 to subsequent amendment 7.</p> <p>The different data sets available at this time that HCA can share were pulled at different times and based off of the different sets of data received: 1) enrollment counts by zip code for Subscribers and Dependents for 2016-2017 (Carrier claims data) and 2) year of birth and gender data (OSPI report).</p> <p>Please note that the data provided is aggregate data received by the Health Care Authority (HCA), and does not encompass a complete picture of the populations to be served under this RFP. The data is subject to change by HCA after the Apparently Successful Bidder(s) are announced, based on then-current data. Bidders are advised that they should rely upon their own experts and their own sources when responding to this RFP. HCA is not liable in any way to any bidder with respect to the data conveyed by HCA to the bidders under this RFP.</p>

48	Appendix 5	Please confirm all the charts in Appendix 5 should be run using WA standards.	<p>In a subsequent amendment to be released soon, the following adjustments will be made:</p> <p>(1) Exhibit I - Provider Network, section 1, item i will be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>[Mandatory not Scored] Network adequacy, by providing the network adequacy filings the Bidder submits to Washington, Idaho, and/or Oregon, whichever states the Bidder intends to offer a Service Area in for the SEBB Program. For each state, Bidder must attest whether or not they meet the state network adequacy standards.</p> <p>(2) Appendix 5, Provider Network Adequacy, will be deleted.</p>
49	Appendix 5	We are unclear on the ask to provide travel distance standards for home health providers as these providers travel to the member. Our aim is to ensure we have an adequate number of agencies providing services to all the counties within our service area; would HCA like us to respond confirming we have home health providers that are licensed to serve all counties in our service area?	<p>In a subsequent amendment to be released soon, the following adjustments will be made:</p> <p>(1) Exhibit I - Provider Network, section 1, item i will be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>[Mandatory not Scored] Network adequacy, by providing the network adequacy filings the Bidder submits to Washington, Idaho, and/or Oregon, whichever states the Bidder intends to offer a Service Area in for the SEBB Program. For each state, Bidder must attest whether or not they meet the state network adequacy standards.</p> <p>(2) Appendix 5, Provider Network Adequacy, will be deleted.</p>