

# COUNTY OF GRANT



## ADDENDUM NO. 2

**RFP No: 23-08**

**RFP Title: TU CASA CRISIS CENTER CONSULTANT SERVICES**

The following are a list of questions and responses that were submitted regarding the above-referenced RFP.

---

**Question No. 1:** Is this a qualifications-based RFP opportunity as referred to on page 7, Section 1 – Instructions, 7) Contract Award?

**Response No. 1:** Yes.

---

**Question No. 2:** Assuming that this procurement is a qualification-based opportunity, is it expected that proposers only address the items specified in Section 4 – Evaluation Criteria which stipulates Capacity and Capability; Personnel Experience and Qualifications; and Proximity to, or Familiarity with Grant County; or are proposers expected to respond to Section 3 – Submittal Format Requirements, which appears to list the consulting project’s deliverables and not proposal submission requirements? Please clarify what the format requirements are for the proposal.

**Answer No. 2:** The proposers are not expected to only address the items specified in Section 4. HMS and Grant County are looking for the Deliverables in Section 3 as well as the Evaluation Criteria in Section 4 to be addressed.

---

**Question No. 3:** At the end of Section 3, it states, “Bidding parties will provide HMS with the timeline needed to provide the final deliverables as per the scope of work.” Is this an

expectation to be included in the final report of this consulting project, or is this an item to be addressed in the proposal?

**Answer No. 3:** It would be beneficial to have the offeror provide an approximate project timeline within the proposal with HMS' understanding that this approximate project timeline is only an estimation based on known and unknown factors. The timeline also needs to be addressed in the final report of the consulting project.

---

**Question No. 4:** Is it expected that the Contractor Qualifications that are delineated under Section 2 –Scope of Services on page 16 be addressed individually within the proposal under Capacity and Capabilities?

**Answer No. 4:** Yes, placing these responses in the Capacity and Capabilities sections is acceptable with a note referencing the responses back to Section 2, Scope of Services.

---

**Question No. 5:** Is the Tu Casa non-residential Crisis Triage Center (CTC) license still valid? If so, when does it expire?

**Answer No. 5:** Yes, this license is still valid. It is a temporary license and has to be renewed every three months. It expires on 06/30/2023.

---

**Question No. 6:** How many recliners were available when the CTC was operational?

**Answer No. 6:** There was the plan to have 7 available, but when we opened during the pandemic we only used 3 of them. It remains designed with 7.

---

**Question No. 7:** What was the Medicaid cost-based payment rate when the CTC was operational?

**Answer No. 7:** The bundled payment rate was \$1,016.16. If a patient was seen initially by the medical provider before admission we were able to also bill our FQHS PPS rate for that visit.

---

**Question No. 8:** Is the Medicaid CTC provider agreement still valid?

**Answer No. 8:** Yes

---

**Question No. 9:** Will Grant County offer safety net funding for the 30% of CTC admissions who would not be expected to be enrolled in Medicaid? If not, is there a plan for covering this loss?

**Answer No. 9:** Most likely, no. The current agreement allows for uncompensated care credits back to the facility lease.

---

**Question No. 10:** When the Tu Casa CTC was operational, were the law enforcement agencies within the county dropping off individuals at the CTC who were experiencing a crisis? If so, what percentage of admissions were law enforcement drop-offs?

**Answer No. 10:** About a third of the admissions were brought in by law enforcement. We expect this to increase with the recent New Mexico Legislative changes (SB310).

---

**Question No. 11:** When Tu Casa CTC was operational, what was the timeframe over which it remained open and what were the total number of admissions during this period?

**Answer No. 11:** The CTC was operational for two (2) months and we had 19 admissions in total.

---

**Question No. 12:** The RFP refers to “reinstate social detox service” and while this is certainly doable, are Grant County and HMS open to facility-based crisis services also offering medication-assisted withdrawal management?

**Answer No. 12:** Yes, the Grant County Detention Center uses the MAT program and HMS is open to this if the business model is effective.

---

**Question No. 13:** Are law enforcement officers within Grant County trained Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) officers? If so, what percentage of them carry CIT Certification?

**Answer No. 13:** Currently in the Grant County Sheriff’s Office, 60% of the officers are CIT certified. The Sheriff’s intention is to have all the officers certified.

---

**Question No. 14:** Has Grant County ever pursued agreements with the surrounding counties for the CTC to become a regional service resource? If so, what was the outcome?

**Answer No. 14:** No, the County has not pursued agreements with the surrounding counties.

---

**Question No. 15:** Is the intent of Grant County and HMS to incorporate crisis stabilization beds into the Tu Casa CTC or to provide CTC beds in another facility? If so, has the facility been identified and is Grant County prepared to assume the related capital costs?

**Answer No. 15:** The plan is to incorporate crisis stabilization beds into the Tu Casa Facility with a renovation (construction) project.

---

**Question No. 16:** The Gila Regional Medical Center Behavioral Health Unit (BHU) closed and it operated with 10 beds. Is the former BHU available to serve as a residential CTC?

**Answer No. 16:** No

---

**Question No. 17:** In the last NM Legislative Session, SB310 was enacted to allow law enforcement to transport those in custody and on an involuntary status to a CTC. This will require changes to DOH CTC regulations to safely manage those admitted involuntarily. Is it the intent of Grant County to have the CTC admit those on involuntary status and to make the necessary CTC building modifications that this change will require?

**Answer No. 17:** Yes, this is the intent.

---

**Question No. 18:** Is HMS and other behavioral healthcare providers within Grant County actively participating in the use of SYNCRONYS, NM's Health Information Exchange?

**Answer No. 18:** Yes, up to the HIE's capabilities at this time.

---

**Question No. 19:** Is HMS and other behavioral health care providers within Grant County actively participating in the use of PreManage ED?

**Answer No. 19:** Yes.

---

**Question No. 20:** Has the Grant County Regional Dispatch Authority been trained on the mission and launch of 988 and have transfer protocol agreements been executed between 911 and 988?

**Answer No. 20:** We had a local 988 workgroup that was trained on 988 launch. It was established that Grant County was not ready for 988 to insure the services that 988 wants. The first being, not having a 24/7 facility to take the patients to, no trained volunteers to go to the homes of the patients. Dispatch is receiving calls from 988.

---

**Question No. 21:** Is Grant County and HMS planning on the establishment of mobile crisis teams that are in alignment with NM's CMS Planning Grant? If so, are Grant County and HMS prepared for mobile crisis teams to be dispatched directly from 988?

**Answer No. 21:** The intent is to develop a mobile crisis team within Grant County and as part of our CCBHC certification. The timeline and more specific details are not known as of yet.

---

**Question No. 22:** Has Grant County and HMS actively engaged in the marketing of 988 within the County? If so, has this marketing resulted in increasing the 988 contacts originating from Grant County and by what percentage?

**Answer No. 22:** Yes. The marketing did result in increasing the 988 contacts however, obtaining the specific data for Grant County has been difficult and it is an evolving reporting process with the state.

---

-End of Addendum-

**Notice:** All other items of the RFP Packet remain the same. Acknowledgement of this addendum on Appendix B of the solicitation documents is **required**.

By: /s/ Veronica Rodriguez,  
Chief Procurement Officer

Date: 05/01/2023