

Suite 401 DNA Building
 238 Archbishop Flores St.
 Hagåtña, Guam 96910



TRANSMITTAL

To:	Mr. Edward M. Birn Director Department of Administration 590 South Marine Corps Drive, ITC Building, Suite 224 Tamuning, Guam 96913 Phone: (671) 475-1101/1250 Fax: (671) 477-6788 Email: edward.birn@doa.guam.gov	From:	Benjamin J.F. Cruz Public Auditor Office of Public Accountability
	Mr. D. Graham Botha, Esq. Counsel for General Service Agency ITC Bldg., 2 nd floor 590 S. Marine Corps. Drive Tamuning, Guam 96913 Phone: (671) 475-2709/10 Fax: (671) 477-2493 Email: graham.botha@gsadoa.guam.gov	Pages:	15 (including cover page)
CC:	Mr. Louie J. Yanza, Esq. Attorney for Appellant TakeCare Insurance Company, Inc. Law Office of Louie J. Yanza, P.C. MVP Building 862 S. Marine Corps. Dr., Ste. 203 Tamuning, Guam 96913 Phone: (671) 989-3009 Email: admin@jurisguam.com ; lyanza@jurisguam.com	Date:	March 6, 2024
		Phone:	(671) 475-0390 x. 204
		Fax:	(671) 472-7951

Re: OPA-PA-24-003 Decision

For Review
 Please Comment
 Please Reply
 Please Recycle

Comments:

Please acknowledge receipt of this transmittal by re-sending this cover page along with your firm or agency's receipt stamp, date, and initials of receiver.

Thank you,
 Jerrick Hernandez, Auditor
jhernandez@guamopa.com



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC AUDITOR
PROCUREMENT APPEALS
TERRITORY OF GUAM**

In the Appeal of TakeCare Insurance Company, Inc., <p style="text-align: center;">Appellant.</p> <hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/>)))))	Appeal No: OPA-PA-24-003 DECISION
--	-----------------------	--

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the Decision of the Public Auditor, pursuant to 2 G.A.R. § 12110, for Appeal No. OPA-PA-24-003. Appellant TakeCare Insurance Company, Inc. (“TakeCare”) filed its appeal on September 18, 2024, for review of the Department of Administration’s (“DOA”) actions related to Request for Proposal No. DOA/HRD/EB-RFP-GHI-25-001, the FY 2025 Government of Guam Group Health Insurance (the “RFP”). The Appeal was heard on January 25, 2025, before Public Auditor Benjamin J. F. Cruz. Louie J. Yanza, Esq. appeared on behalf of Appellant TakeCare, and D. Graham Botha, Esq. appeared for Respondent DOA. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law were filed by TakeCare and DOA on February 10, 2025.

II. JURISDICTION: STANDARD REVIEW

The decision of the Public Auditor under appeal is authorized by 5 G.C.A. § 5703. The determination of an issue, the findings of fact, and the decision of the Public Auditor are as stated in 5 G.C.A. § 5704.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Public Auditor shall have the power to review and determine *de novo* any matter properly submitted. 5 G.C.A. § 5703 (a), and in reaching this Decision, has considered and incorporates herein the procurement record and all documents submitted by the parties, and has considered the testimony and arguments made during the hearing held on January 25, 2024. Based on the aforementioned record in this matter, the Public Auditor makes the following findings of fact:

1. On May 23, 2024, DOA issued the RFP, which sought administrators or insurance companies to administer the Government of Guam’s self-insured group health insurance program. DOA was seeking proposals for an exclusive Third Party Administrator (“TPA”) to administer for medical (to include vision), pharmacy, and or dental services.
2. The RFP was acknowledged by six potential TPAs, but proposals were only received from four (4) TPAs on June 18, 2024: NetCare Life & Health (NetCare), Calvo’s SelectCare Insurance, Inc. (SelectCare), Island Home Insurance Company (StayWell) and TakeCare. All four TPAs submitted proposals for medical, pharmacy and dental.
3. The RFP required “All offerors must submit a cost proposal for an exclusive proposal. This cost proposal would apply under an exclusive arrangement. Please see Exhibit E. All offerors are required to submit for a self-funded medical, to include pharmacy and vision, and/or self- funded dental premiums and rates at a minimum. This information will be used along with current enrollment information to assist the Negotiating Team and its consultant in analyzing the cost portion of the proposal.”
4. Exhibit E of the RFP indicated “Premium Retention Quotation See Attached”, but there was no attachment.
5. The RFP Proposal evaluation and negotiation procedure section identified five phases.
6. In Phase I, proposals were initially screened to determine whether the minimum requirements specified in the RFP were met.

- 1 7. In Phase II, the Negotiation Team evaluated and ranked proposals using a relative weight
2 assignment to the factors rated on a scale from zero (0) to one hundred (100), with zero (0)
3 for no response and one hundred (100) being the highest possible score. For purposes of
4 evaluations, exclusive proposals were evaluated and ranked together. The offerors were
5 ranked in accordance with the number of total points.
6
- 7 8. The Negotiating Team evaluated all proposals and voted to invite all four TPAs to advance
8 to Phase III due to close scores.
- 9 9. During Phase III negotiations, the Team evaluated the medical, pharmacy, and dental
10 proposals, including the financial terms.
11
- 12 10. Milliman Inc., the government actuarial consultant, conducted a financial analysis of the
13 TPAs' pricing terms, which the Negotiating Team members were instructed to consider in
14 the final ranking of the pricing terms
- 15 11. In Phase IV, proposals were evaluated with final ranking of exclusive contracts and
16 recommendation of the most economical and beneficial offer to the Governor. The RFP
17 states that "the negotiating team shall determine which of the TPAs offering exclusive
18 coverage will be best for the Government, and for the top two medical and dental TPAs to
19 the Governor for selection of one medical (inclusive of vision), contract, one pharmacy,
20 and one dental contract."
21
- 22 12. The negotiating team recommended that TakeCare be awarded the exclusive TPA contract
23 for medical, pharmacy benefits, and dental benefits, with the second option to award
24 SelectCare the exclusive TPA contract for medical and pharmacy benefits, and NetCare the
25 exclusive TPA contract for dental benefits, and this recommendation in the form of the
26 Health Insurance Team Recommendation was provided to the Governor on August 9, 2024.
27
28

- 1 13. During Phase V, the contracting stage, the Governor decided whether to accept the
2 recommendation of the Negotiating team. The Governor made a selection on August 13,
3 2024 and selected SelectCare for medical and pharmacy benefits, and NetCare for dental
4 benefits. (Ex C, pgs. 1169-1187).
5
6 14. TPA Notices regarding selection and non-selection were sent out on August 14, 2024 (Ex E,
7 pgs. 1241-1266).
8
9 15. TakeCare filed a protest on August 27, 2024, and the protest was denied by DOA on
10 September 4, 2024. In its denial of protest letter, DOA stated “Lower costs are not solely
11 based on TPA fees, but also expected claims costs. This total makes up the total funding
12 rates that influence overall cost. The Negotiating Team’s third-party actuaries conducted an
13 independent evaluation of the cost of each proposal that included the overall costs.”
14
15 16. TakeCare filed an appeal to the OPA on September 18, 2024.
16
17 17. On September 19, 2024, the Attorney General of Guam approved DOA’s Declaration of
18 Substantial Interest, which determined that the award of the contract without delay is
19 necessary to protect substantial interests of the Territory in accordance with 5 GCA
20 §5425(g), citing an imminent threat to public health, safety and welfare.
21
22 18. The formal evidentiary hearing was held on January 23, 2025, before the Public Auditor.

21 IV. ANALYSIS

22 A. TAKECARE’S ALEGATION THAT DOA UTILIZED CRITERIA NOT CITED IN 23 RFP TO DETERMINE MOST RESPONSIVE AND RESOPINSIBLE BIDDER IS 24 VALID.

25 In its appeal, TakeCare alleges DOA issued an RFP that did not state that claims cost were to be
26 part of the responsive bid. DOA required claims cost to be part of the responsive bid but did not
27 specifically state anywhere that the RFP required claims cost, but only for TPA fees. Moreover,
28

1 DOA's consulting group, Milliman Inc. improperly adjusted TakeCare's provider reimbursement
2 cost by .02% without adjusting for SelectCare. Therefore, TakeCare was not on a level playing field
3 with SelectCare.
4

5 Mr. Arvin Lojo, TakeCare's Health Plan Administrator, testified that during TakeCare's review
6 of the RFP, nowhere did DOA require the bidder to provide what the claims cost will be. Rather,
7 Exhibit E of the RFP only required what the bidder's TPA fees would be.

8 In Appellant's Exhibit 2, which contained the relevant pages of TakeCare's bid, they only
9 submitted what TakeCare's TPA fees would be. For example, PPO 1500, HAS 2000, RSP,
10 TakeCare proposed \$20.50 for medical and \$2.00 for pharmacy per employee per month ("PEPM").
11

12 In contrast, Mr. Lojo pointed out that in the 2024 RFP, DOA specifically required not only the
13 TPA fees, but also the claims cost. As seen in Appellant's Exhibit 6, TakeCare's proposed bid for
14 2024 RFP, in section 3.a, the base diagnostic and preventative cost per covered life per month is
15 \$68.75. In section 4.a, this base cost is adjusted by \$7.69 and \$1.73 for utilization and unit cost,
16 respectively for both FY 2022 to FY 2023 and FY 2023 to FY 2024. Similarly, under the same
17 exhibit 6, basic and restorative procedures had a base cost of \$36.76 and this was adjusted by \$4.12
18 and \$0.93, respectively for the same factors and period. See Appendix 1 of this decision.
19

20 The exhibits for Exhibit E of the 2025 RFP and Exhibit E of the 2024 RFP are different in that
21 the 2024 RFP requires the bidder to submit its expected claims cost. Nowhere does Exhibit E inquire
22 on what the claims costs will be. See Appendix 2 of this decision. As such, it was unreasonable for
23 DOA to include claims costs without notifying the bidders or potential bidders to include claims
24 cost in their bid. In addition, DOA did not determine TakeCare's bid was non responsive for
25 providing the claims cost as required in the Exhibit E form for FY 2024 and not including claims
26 cost in the required Exhibit E form for FY 2025.
27
28

1 In addition, Mr. Lojo testified that Milliman Consulting adjusted provider reimbursements on
2 TakeCare's bid without adjusting for SelectCare. This resulted in TakeCare having a higher bid
3 than what it should have been. For example, in Appendix B page 13 of the Governor's Briefing,
4 Milliman adjusted at 1.02 for TakeCare but not for SelectCare and kept it at 1.00. As a result,
5 TakeCare's bid was considerably higher, despite it being the lowest responsive bidder and the
6 negotiating team recommending TakeCare be awarded the TPA.
7

8 Ms. Barbara Dewey of Milliman Consulting testified and acknowledged that TakeCare was
9 adjusted for provider reimbursement. However, Ms. Dewey admitted that she did not know the
10 actual provider reimbursement since bidders only provide the range of what their provider
11 reimbursement fee is.
12

13 Mr. Edward Birn, the Director of DOA testified that the claims cost is always considered in
14 awarding the bid, but nowhere did Mr. Birn point out that the RFP required the bidder to provide
15 claims cost.
16

17 Adherence to the plain language of the RFP, is essential for bidders and the integrity of the
18 procurement system. Baldrige v. Government Printing Office, 513 Fed. Appx. 965, 967 (Fed. Cir.
19 2013) ("If the plain language of the IFB unambiguously called for delustered laminate film, that
20 language controls."); Professional Bldg. Concepts, Inc. v. City of Cent. Falls Housing Authority,
21 783 F.Supp. 1558, 1563 (U.S. Dist. R.I. 1992), aff'd Professional Bldg. Concepts, Inc. v. City of
22 Cent Falls, 974 F.2d. 1 (1st Cir. 1992). ("Unless ambiguous, it is the language of the IFB which
23 controls the form that a big guarantee must take").
24

25 In DFS Guam LP v. GIAA, 2020 Guam 20, one of the many Guam Supreme Court opinions
26 concerning the years long dispute concerning the concession contract at the airport, the Court
27 addressed the issue of whether additional benefits to GIAA could be considered as part of the award
28

1 of the concession contract. The additional benefits were not a part of the criteria contained in the
2 bid specifications. As part of its analysis upholding the trial court’s denial of summary judgment,
3 the Court stated:
4

5 Regardless of whether GIAA was required to obtain a concessions contract pursuant to an
6 IFB or an RFP—an issue that the parties continue to dispute—**GIAA was obligated to**
7 **evaluate the proposals only according to evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation.**
8 See 5 GCA §§ 5211(e), 5216(c), 5216(e) (2005); see also 2 GAR Div. 4 §§ 3109(c)(2)(B),
9 (n), 3114(f)(2); cf. 5 GCA § 5030(t) (as used in the Procurement Code, “[s]hall denotes the
10 imperative”). “It is ‘hornbook law that agencies must evaluate proposals and make awards
11 based on the criteria stated in the solicitation.’” NEQ, LLC v. United States, 88 Fed. Cl. 38,
12 47 (2009) (quoting Banknote Corp. of Am., Inc. v. United States, 56 Fed. Cl. 377, 386
13 (2003)). Doing so broadly supports the underlying policies and purpose of the Procurement
14 Code. See 5 GCA § 5001(b); accord Fairbanks N. Star Borough Sch. Dist. v. Bowers Office
15 Prods., Inc., 851 P.2d 56, 58 (Alaska 1992) (“[A] government agency which solicits bids for
16 goods or services has an implied contractual duty to fairly and honestly consider bids . . .”).
17 Accordingly, if the evaluation criteria do not permit GIAA to consider the additional benefits
18 included in Lotte’s proposal, then GIAA would not be entitled to judgment as a matter of
19 law on DFS’s out-of-scope-benefit claims. In order to resolve this question, we therefore
20 must analyze the RFP itself.

21 DFS Guam LP v. GIAA, 2020 Guam 20 ¶ 136.

22 In accordance with Guam law and as confirmed by DFS v. GIAA, DOA is required to only
23 consider the criteria in the bid specifications when evaluating and ultimately awarding a contract.
24 Guam law does not permit DOA to base its award of the GovGuam health insurance contract on an
25 undisclosed specification. “No criteria may be used in bid evaluation that are not set forth in the
26 Invitation for Bids.” 5 GCA § 5211 (e). By relying on claims cost, which is not an item contained
27 in the bid specifications, DOA prevented all bidders, including TakeCare, from making an
28 intelligent evaluation and bid. By placing TakeCare at an unfair disadvantage, DOA did not “ensure
the fair and equitable treatment of all persons who deal with the procurement system of Guam.” 5
G.C.A. § 5001(b)(4) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 1, § 1102(3)

 A similar incident took place in *Browning-Ferris Indus. v. City of Lakawanna*, 204 A.D.2d 1047
(N.Y. App. Div. 1994). In that case, the city awarded a waste disposal contract to a company based

1 on a criterion that was not specified in the contract documents. Specifically, the city improperly
2 considered the distance from the Lackawanna City garage to each bidder's disposal site. The City
3 argued that the criterion was properly considered as mileage and travel time would factor into which
4 bid resulted in the lowest actual cost to the City. The Court was not convinced.
5

6 Relying on principles very similar to provisions in the Guam Procurement Law, the Court in
7 Browning-Ferris stated that:

8 It is well settled that a municipal service contract is governed by the provisions of article 5-
9 A of the General Municipal Law, which are designed "with the dual purposes of fostering
10 honest competition and also to guard against favoritism, improvidence, extravagance, fraud
11 and corruption" (Le Cesse Bros. Contr. v Town Bd., 62 AD2d 28, 31, affd on opn below 46
12 NY2d 960). To promote those purposes, a municipality is obligated, "in advance of bidding,
13 to convey in precise terms to prospective bidders the exact basis on which the contract will
14 be awarded, so that each such bidder will be enabled to make an intelligent evaluation and
15 bid" (Matter of Suffolk Roadways v Minuse, 19 AD2d 888, 889; see also, Matter of
16 Progressive Dietary Consultants of N.Y. v Wyoming County, 90 AD2d 214, 217).
17 Furthermore, the municipality "is required to furnish specifications which state the nature of
18 the work as definitely as practicable and which contain all the information necessary to
19 enable bidders to prepare their bids" and "it must award the contract on the basis provided
20 for in the specifications and determine the 'lowest responsible bidder' in accordance with the
21 specifications" (Matter of Progressive Dietary Consultants of N.Y. v Wyoming County,
22 supra, at 217).

23 Browning-Ferris, 204 A.D. 2d at 1047-1048.

24 In the present case, DOA is making a similar argument with respect to the criterion of claims
25 costs. DOA is arguing that claims costs were properly relied upon when it awarded the contract as
26 it would help determine the lowest cost to the Government. The problem with this argument is that
27 claims costs were not specified in the bid specifications. As noted above, Guam law does not permit
28 DOA to award the contract based upon an undisclosed specification. By relying on an undisclosed
specification, DOA prevented TakeCare from intelligently evaluating all the criteria and submitting
a thorough and competitive bid.

1 Guam law requires that an “RFP shall call for a plan that provides a level playing field with
2 current and future private insurers ...” 4 G.C.A. § 4302(c)(11). A level playing field does not by
3 definition exist if DOA adjusted TakeCare’s costs without also adjusting SelectCare costs. By doing
4 so, it gave the appearance that TakeCare’s TPA fees and rates are higher than SelectCare.
5

6 As shown under Exhibit 3 of the submitted procurement appeal exhibits, the underlying claims
7 cost for both SelectCare and TakeCare were the same amounts. However, under the same Exhibit
8 3, appendix B, TakeCare’s claims cost were adjusted by .02% in FY 2022 and 1% in FY 2023 which
9 were not included in SelectCare’s claims cost. Apart from considering provider reimbursement,
10 additional consideration should have included benefit design (preferred copayment to preferred
11 providers), provider delivery system (lower copayment at preferred provider) and value-based
12 benefits & services (robust wellness, fitness and disease management programs that are nationally
13 recognized) that contributes to minimizing healthcare costs for the Government of Guam.
14

15 The Public Auditor finds that DOA issued an RFP that did not state that claims cost was to be
16 part of the bid evaluation to determine the most responsive bidder. DOA required claims cost to be
17 part of the bid but did not specifically state anywhere that the RFP required claims cost, but only for
18 TPA fees. Moreover, DOA’s consulting group, Milliman Inc. improperly adjusted TakeCare’s
19 provider reimbursement cost by .02% without adjusting for SelectCare. Therefore, TakeCare was
20 not on a level playing field under 4 G.C.A. § 4302(c)(11), and the Public Auditor finds that DOA
21 violated 5 G.C.A. § 5001(b)(4) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 1, § 1102(3) and 5 GCA § 5211(e) and
22 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 3, § 3109(n)(1).
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **B. RATIFYING AND AFFIRMING CONTRACT TO SELECTCARE IS IN THE**
2 **BEST INTEREST OF THE GOVERNMENT OF GUAM**

3 If after an award it is determined that a solicitation or award of a contract is in violation of
4 law and the person awarded the contract has not acted in bad faith, then the contract may be ratified
5 and affirmed provided that doing so is in the best interest of the Government of Guam. 5 G.C.A. §
6 5452(a)(1)(A) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 9, § 9106(1)(a).
7

8 As set forth above, DOA used criteria not identified in the RFP, which applied an additional
9 calculation to TakeCare that it did not apply to SelectCare, violating 5 G.C.A. § 5001(b)(4) and 2
10 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 1, § 1102(3) and 5 GCA § 5211(e) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 3, § 3109(n)(1).
11 Further, it is undisputed that the RFP was awarded to SelectCare for medical and pharmacy benefits,
12 and there has been no evidence in this matter showing that has acted in bad faith.

13 On September 19, 2024, the Attorney General of Guam approved a Declaration of
14 Substantial Interest for the RFP to move forward, after TakeCare filed its protest. The contract with
15 SelectCare is about to reach the halfway mark of its contract period. The Public Auditor finds
16 that the award to SelectCare should be ratified and affirmed for the same reasons as identified in the
17 Declaration of Substantial Interest, and for the fact that switching insurance providers in the middle
18 of the fiscal year could have a direct imminent threat to public health, safety and welfare. However,
19 DOA is admonished for its actions in this RFP, and should ensure future RFPs will clearly include
20 all calculations it will use as criteria when evaluating proposals.
21

22 Therefore, in accordance with 5 G.C.A. § 5452(a)(1)(A) and 2 G.A.R. Div. 4, Chap. 9, §
23 9106(1)(a)(i), DOA may ratify and affirm its RFP contract with SelectCare as it is in the best interest
24 of the Government of Guam. However, the Public Auditor finds that TakeCare is entitled to its
25 reasonable costs incurred in connection with the solicitation, including the bid preparation costs and
26 August 27, 2024 protest, excluding attorney's fees, pursuant to 5 G.C.A. § 5425(h), because there
27
28

1 was a reasonable likelihood that it may have been awarded the contract, but for DOA’s violation of
2 5 G.C.A. § 5001(b)(4) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 1, § 1102(3). TakeCare shall submit its costs to
3 DOA no later than thirty (30) days after the date of this decision is rendered, and DOA shall have
4 two (2) weeks to file an objection relating to said costs after the date DOA receives them.
5

6 **V. CONCLUSION**

7 Based on the foregoing, the Public Auditor makes the following determinations:

- 8 A. TakeCare’s allegation that DOA utilized criteria not cited in the RFP to determine
9 most responsive and responsible bidder is valid.
- 10 B. Ratifying and affirming contract to SelectCare is in the best interest of the
11 Government of Guam.
- 12 C. TakeCare’s appeal is hereby GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.
- 13 D. DOA is admonished for violating of 5 G.C.A. § 5001(b)(4) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4
14 Chap. 1, § 1102(3) and 5 GCA § 5211(e) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 3, § 3109(n)(1).
- 15 E. TakeCare is entitled to its reasonable costs incurred in connection with the
16 solicitation, including the bid preparation costs and August 27, 2024 protest,
17 excluding attorney’s fees, pursuant to 5 G.C.A. § 5425(h), because there was a
18 reasonable likelihood that it may have been awarded the contract, but for DOA’s
19 violation of 5 G.C.A. § 5001(b)(4) and 2 G.A.R., Div. 4 Chap. 1, § 1102(3).
- 20 F. The parties shall bear their respective attorney’s fees.
- 21
- 22

23 This is a Final Administrative Decision for Appeal No. OPA-PA-24-003. The Parties are
24 hereby informed of their right to appeal the Public Auditor’s Decision to the Superior Court of Guam
25 in accordance with Part D of Article 9 of 5 G.C.A. §5481(a) within fourteen (14) days after receipt
26 of a Final Administrative Decision. A copy of this Decision shall be provided to the Parties and their
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
respective attorneys, in accordance with 5 G.C.A. §5702, and shall be made available for review on
the OPA website at www.opaguam.org.

DATED this 6th day of March 2025.



BENJAMIN J.F. CRUZ
Public Auditor of Guam

Appendix 1:

Except from Appellant Exhibit 6

FY 2024 Dental Plan
 Proposed Administration fee for Exclusive Provider
 Contract Year October 2023 to September 2024

1. Please provide your estimated benefit costs and proposed administrative fee (as a per employee per month (PEPM) basis) for dental expenses only

Per Enrolled Employee per Month (PEPM)	Estimated Benefit Cost	Proposed Administrative Cost
Active Classes		
Retiree Classes	\$1,059,822.57	\$3.50 PEPM
Former Class		

2a. Please explain what time period you used for your base period.

October 1, 2021 - March 31, 2023
 TakeCare utilized its actual claims experience for the base period referenced based on the entire population and potential risk factor.

3a. Please provide a breakdown of your baseline benefit costs by the following classes and metrics:

Class	Utilization per 1,000 lives	Average cost (\$)	Price amount per covered life per month (\$)	Allowed amount per covered life per month (\$)	Total classes per covered life per month (\$)
Active					
Diagnostic and Preventive	144.42	\$79.22	\$76.81	\$68.72	\$68.57
Basic and Restorative	32.85	\$186.43	\$56.18	\$48.29	\$38.76
Major and Replacement	4.09	\$139.30	\$17.91	\$11.53	\$5.87
Other	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Retiree					
Diagnostic and Preventive					
Basic and Restorative					
Major and Replacement					
Other					
Former					
Diagnostic and Preventive	338.84	\$69.86	\$307.99	\$196.45	\$196.45
Basic and Restorative	571.74	\$42.51	\$104.75	\$4.67	\$4.67
Major and Replacement	68.84	\$12.36	\$30.25	\$8.73	\$8.73
Other	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3b. Please explain what assumptions you have made to distribute the expected base period utilization and cost among the service categories listed above.
 TakeCare utilized its actual claims experience adjusted based on the entire population and potential risk factor to allocate the expected base period utilization.

4a. Please enter the trends you have used to trend your base period experience to FY 2024. Please add or remove columns if you used a base period other than 2022.

Trend classes	FY 2022 to FY 2023				FY 2023 to FY 2024			
	Utilization	Unit cost	Population adjustment	Other	Utilization	Unit cost	Population adjustment	Other
Active/Retiree								
Diagnostic and Preventive	\$7.69	\$1.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7.69	\$1.73	\$0.00	\$0.00
Basic and Restorative	\$4.12	\$0.93	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4.12	\$0.93	\$0.00	\$0.00
Major and Replacement	\$0.66	\$0.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.66	\$0.15	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Retiree								
Diagnostic and Preventive								
Basic and Restorative								
Major and Replacement								
Other								
Former								
Diagnostic and Preventive	\$22.01	\$4.95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22.01	\$4.95	\$0.00	\$0.00
Basic and Restorative	\$6.13	\$1.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6.13	\$1.34	\$0.00	\$0.00
Major and Replacement	\$0.98	\$0.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.98	\$0.22	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4b. Please explain what components you have included in your "Other" trends

Not Applicable

Appendix 2:

Excerpt from RFP NO. DOA/HRD/EB-RFP-GHI-25-001

FY 2025 Medical, Pharmacy, and Dental Administration Costs
Self-funded administration cost per employee per month (PEPM)
 Contract Year October 2024 - September 2025

Please provide your administrative fee on a per employee per month (PEPM) basis.
 Vision expenses should be included with medical expenses.
 Administration fees should not include PCORI fees.

PPO 1500, HSA 2000, RSP, and Foster

Proposed self-funded administration cost PEPM if bidder is awarded medical and pharmacy contract, but not dental contract:

Medical and Pharmacy

Per enrolled employee per month		Proposed administration cost PEPM for:	
Plan	Subscriber class	Medical	Pharmacy
PPO 1500, HSA	Actives and Retirees		
2000, RSP			
Foster			

Proposed self-funded administration cost PEPM if bidder is awarded dental contract only:

Dental

Per enrolled employee per month	Proposed administration cost PEPM for:
Subscriber class	Dental
Actives and Retirees	
Foster	

Proposed self-funded administration cost PEPM if bidder is awarded medical, pharmacy, and dental contracts:

Medical and Pharmacy

Per enrolled employee per month		Proposed administration cost PEPM for:	
Plan	Subscriber class	Medical	Pharmacy
PPO 1500, HSA	Actives and Retirees		
2000, RSP			
Foster			

Dental

Per enrolled employee per month	Proposed administration cost PEPM for:
Subscriber class	Dental
Actives and Retirees	
Foster	