

**MARYLAND STATE TREASURER'S OFFICE
Louis L. Goldstein Treasury Building, Room 109
80 Calvert Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401**

**PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE
February 5, 2013**

**Re: Request for Proposal for Electronic Payment Card Services
for the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation,
Division of Unemployment Insurance, RFP #DLLR-EPC-01172013**

State of Maryland Representatives:

Anne Jewell, Procurement Officer, State Treasurer's Office
Mary Christine Jackman, Director of Cash Management, State Treasurer's Office
David McGlone, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Unemployment Insurance, Department of
Labor, Licensing and Regulation ("DLLR")
James McVicker, Deputy Director, Contributions Division, Unemployment Insurance, DLLR
Mary Miller, Director of Unemployment Insurance, DLLR

A Pre-proposal Conference was held on February 5, 2013 at the Maryland State Treasurer's Office regarding the Request for Proposals ("RFP") for Electronic Payment Card Services for the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, Division of Unemployment Insurance ("DLLR/DUI"). The meeting opened with introductions by the State of Maryland representatives and then by other attendees from the State, as well as representatives from the following firms: Bank of America Merrill Lynch, Citibank, N.A., JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., M&T Bank, MasterCard Worldwide, Visa, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., and Xerox State and Local Solutions, Inc.

The Procurement Officer briefly addressed certain questions about the desired format of the technical proposal and required affidavits, all of which are addressed in the Questions and Answers document ("Q&A") published on February 8, 2013. She further indicated that an Amendment to the RFP seeking a direct deposit solution for unemployment insurance ("UI") was forthcoming.

Mr. McVicker commented on the UI debit card program that has been in place for the past five years, and the success of the program for both the State as well as the recipients. He pointed out that the current Contract is no cost to the State and, provided the card is correctly used, recipients are able to avoid fees. Under the current Contract those recipients who elect to have UI benefits deposited to their bank accounts, such deposits are made via ACH transfer through EPCs. He explained that this process allowed DLLR/DUI to provide bank account deposits without having to assume responsibility for maintaining

sensitive banking information. He then expressed the State's desire to transition to a traditional direct deposit service that eliminates the recipient having to go through an EPC card for direct deposit. Mr. McGlone confirmed the desire to have a traditional direct deposit option and referenced a recently published National Consumer Law Center article on the topic. Amendment No. 1 to the RFP details the scope of the desired direct deposit service.

Mr. McVicker provided some background on the evolution of the DLLR/DUI EPC program from its inception. He further described some of its current components, including the practice of issuing EPCs at the time of the first payment of UI benefits. With regard to the funding process for all of the cards, he stated that every evening DLLR/DUI processes all of the claims, determines who will receive UI benefit payments, and generally sends a file to the vendor with the information by 4:00 a.m. He added that processing begins as soon as funding is received, which is typically by 9:00 a.m. wire transfer from the DLLR/DUI trust fund, with the goal being availability of funds to cardholders by noon each day. With Tuesdays being the biggest day for DLLR/DUI, he noted that funding might be later in the day. He then referenced a stop process for seeking to pull back payments made to ineligible recipients.

Mr. McGlone reviewed some of the questions and answers in the Q&A. During the meeting State representatives answered questions from the attendees. A summary of these questions and responses is as follows:

- Q-1. Regarding direct deposit, are you envisioning putting the functionality on the State's website or is the State expecting the vendor to provide functionality for the ACH automatic deposits?
- A-1. DLLR/DUI does not currently have direct deposit functionality on its website and is looking for an optimal solution from Offerors.
- Q-2. The RFP requests six free card usages a month. Do current cardholders experience a surcharge or convenience fee for any and all ATM withdrawals?
- A-2. We currently have four free card usages per month, but are looking for six free withdrawals regardless of whether they are in network or out of network. UI benefits are currently provided on a bi-weekly basis and the State is looking to move toward a weekly benefit payment.
- Q-3. Could you describe DLLR/DUI intentions with regard to social media request in the proposal?
- A-3. Social media has become a big tool in providing services to employers and also to claimants. We are interested in the use of social media and are looking for ideas from Offerors.

- Q-4. As a follow-up regarding social media, do you want a separate section of innovations, enhancements?
- A-4. Item A. 19, Section 3.06 Specific Services, seeks information regarding social media and Offerors should address these services as indicated in the RFP.
- Q-5. If a service is not within the RFP, do you want a separate section?
- A-5. Offerors are asked to describe any services beyond those requested in the RFP that they believe offer additional benefits to DLLR/DUI or claimants/cardholders. See Item 3.d. in Section 4.03 Volume I – Technical Proposal.
- Q-6. Are we correct in our understanding that in-network there is no charge and if it is out-of-network, there could be a charge? To reduce cardholder expenses, will the State consider proposals that expand the ATM access in-network while balancing sufficient out-of-network ATM access?
- A-6. There should be six free withdrawals per month regardless of whether they are in-network or out-of-network. See Item 15 in Section 3.04 Minimum Service Requirements regarding free withdrawals.
- Q-7. Are you finding claimants wanting direct deposit versus the card and is that how you came to the decision about direct deposit?
- A-7. Some claimants have ended up leaving money on their cards and may have wanted to have the money in their bank accounts. DLLR/DUI wants to have this option available up front for claimants who determine, at the time of filing, they would prefer direct deposit.
- Q-8. Pertaining to the change from biweekly to weekly benefit payments, is there a timeline that DLLR/DUI expects to make this change?
- A-8. DLLR/DUI would like to have this change in place by early summer of this year, however, there is no specific timeframe for this project.
- Q-9. Will any other benefits be on the card, such as Workmen’s Comp?
- A-9. No. DLLR/DUI only administers Unemployment Insurance.
- Q-10. The Activity Table provided in the RFP states the average payment of \$325 per week. Can you confirm the actual in 2012 biweekly payment amount per claimant is \$547.32?
- A-10. DLLR/DUI currently computes the average weekly benefit amount.

Q.11. With the new information provided in the Amendment, is the State contemplating an extension of the due date?

A-11. Not at this time.

The pre-proposal conference concluded at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Jewell
Procurement Officer