

## **Questions and Answers-Study Concerning the effects of Legalized Gambling on the Citizens of the State of Connecticut:**

1. Question-What is the estimated budget to fund this Study?

Answer- Currently \$350,000 has been approved for fiscal 2008 (July 1,2007 through June 30, 2008) and an additional \$350,000 for fiscal 2009.

2. Question- Traffic and economic impact studies had been conducted in and around the areas of the casinos. Can those studies be used as a basis from which research will be expanded upon?

Answer- We are looking for more than a recapitulation of former studies. Your proposal should make use of any and all of the available information in addition to any information your firm develops through its interviews, surveys, etc. We're relying on the expertise of your firm to determine the appropriateness of the data being used.

3. Question- Will vendors who have done work or are currently doing work for legalized gaming entities be excluded from this project?

Answer- No.

4. Question- Are proposal submissions limited to a specific number of pages?

Answer-No, however please keep in mind the review committee will be reviewing a lot of information in a short period of time, so please be concise with your responses and avoid extraneous information.

5. Question- Although the RFP has a very stringent Set-Aside Program, the vast majority of the proposed work requires highly specialized data collection, analysis and reporting expertise that is not readily subcontracted. Given the specialized nature of the work required by the RFP, does this work fall under the definition of "public works" as defined in the Personal Service Agreement (Ref. Personal Service Agreement, page 2, Section 1 Non-Discrimination; and page 10, Section XXII(a), 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph). If so, how stringent is the 25% set-aside for minority businesses? If not, would the Division of Special Revenue be willing to waive the set-aside program for SBEs and MBEs for this RFP?

Answer: The RFP says we expect a minimum of 25% of the contract cost to be set-aside for certified small and minority owned enterprises. While we want you to make every effort to utilize certified set-aside contractors, we used the word expect so as not to create a mandate if the situation doesn't warrant it. However, before any discussion of waivers takes place we must evaluate all proposals and should the firm offered a contract as a result of the RFP provide evidence that set-aside contractors are unavailable or provides evidence that the work is highly specialized in nature etc., then we can use that

information as a basis to request an exemption to the Division's set-aside requirements which in turn will be offered to the contractor, if approved. This not something we can address at this point in the contract process, from a potential contractor.

6. Question- In Appendix 2 of the RFP, under Format for Proposals, Section 4, page 4, there is a requirement that all proposed sub-contractors must provide their two most recent financial statements prepared by an independent Certified Public Accountant. Would the Division of Special Revenue be willing to waive this requirement for academic faculty who are proposed to perform a small part of the scope of work but do not have the required financial statements?

Answer- Assuming the University is the proposer, academic faculty are considered employees of the University and therefore would not be required to submit financial statements. If however, the University is an entity separate from the proposer, then the requirements in the RFP apply.

7. Question- Do the proposed evaluation criteria receive equal weight in the review process, or do the criteria receive unequal weight? If the criteria receive unequal weight, what is the weight assigned to each criterion.

Answer- Weights are confidential so as not to encourage proposers to skew their proposals according to the weights in an effort to improve their ratings.

8. Question- Will the contractor be required to obtain ethical clearance from the State of Connecticut prior to conducting any studies in support of the study of the effects of legalized gambling?

Answer- Once the agreement is approved by the Gaming Policy Board, executed by the Executive Director of the Division of Special Revenue, and approved by the Attorney General of the State of Connecticut, as to form, the work may begin.

9. Question- Will the Division of Special Revenue require a public use file containing interview response data? If yes, is there a preferred format for this data file (e.g. SAS, SPSS, etc)?

Answer- Yes, the preferred formats are SAS and Excel.

10. Question- Is there industry-specific information beyond the data posted on the Division of Special Revenue website that can be made available to the contractor for use in conducting the economic impact analysis?

Answer- Not to our knowledge, however, should you find any other relevant information please feel free to utilize it.

11. Question- Does the Division of Special Revenue have preferences regarding specific measures of legalized gambling's "contributions to towns" mentioned in the RFP (I.D.3) or about the time periods of greatest interest?

Answer- We have no preference regarding specific measures. However, the time period should be from the conclusion of the last gaming study to the most current year for which data is available.

12. Question- Does the Division of Special Revenue have any preferences or requirements with regard to the specific time periods over which to analyze the tribal gambling expansion mentioned in Section 1.D.9 of the Scope of Work?

Answer- The time period should be from the conclusion of the last gaming study to the most current year for which data is available.

13. Question- Does the Division of Special Revenue have any preferences or requirements with regard to comparison of the results obtained from the upcoming study to results obtained from studies previously conducted in the State of Connecticut? If so, how important is the comparison?

Answer-The Division believes that it would prove extremely valuable to policy makers if a valid comparison could be made with previous study results. However if you choose a methodology that makes direct comparison invalid, you must tell us that a comparison would be invalid and explain to us why you chose a different methodology and the benefits of the new methodology. We would further expect that you could justify that your chosen methodology would provide a better baseline for future studies with more reliability and validity.

We acknowledge in the RFP, that different methodologies can be considered but it must be with full disclosure and explanation. An example is in Appendix 2, in the Format for Proposals #5 on page 5, Outline of Work. We specifically reference that the South Oaks Gambling Screen was the methodology used in the past studies for evaluating chronic gambling. It would be important for you to note in your proposal if your definition of chronic gambling is different and/or if the methodology you chose to measure chronic gambling is different and would render any direct comparison with past studies invalid or suspect.

14. Question- Does the Division of Special Revenue have any preferences or requirements with regard to the precision for estimates of legalized gambling participation and/or chronic gambling for the total population of Connecticut and/or any specific subgroups in the population?

Answer- The precision of estimates should be based, in your view, on a sample size such that a reasonable person would have a high degree of confidence in the studies findings.

We have no preference to specific subgroups so long as they represent a cross-section of the population.

15. Question- In response to section III of the scope of services, which details the Division's right to publish or distribute the report to third parties, our firm can not provide its work product to third parties. However, we can provide unbranded work products and we can also partner with other advisors that can provide branded reports. Under these conditions, please advise us if we can respond to the RFP.

Answer- We cannot advise your firm whether or not to respond to this RFP. However, should your firm submit a proposal it must abide by all of the RFP and Contract terms and conditions. This study is being conducted utilizing public funds and the subject is of interest to many. We believe that any work submitted by a vendor or its sub-contractors is fully disclosable under Connecticut Freedom of Information laws (C.G.S. Sec. 1-200 et seq.)