

Addendum #1: Questions and Answers

RFP#15-053-04 – Insurance Broker Services

1. County Board member, Ted Sauve, currently serves on County Mutual's Investment Advisory Committee. We find when WCM has ties to someone on the Board, the chances of the insurance program moving to an alternative liability carrier are slim to none. In your honest opinion, will this likely be the case with Marinette County?

Answer: Marinette County will do what is in the best interest of the County.

2. Who is the County's current workers' compensation third party administrator?

Answer: Aegis

3. Who is the broker for the County's excess workers' compensation coverage?

Answer: No Broker

Who is the carrier on the excess?

Answer: Wisconsin County Mutual

4. Is the Twin County Airport Commission responsible for insuring the airport?

Answer: As of June 30, 2015 the County is no longer a partner in the Twin County Airport.

Does Marinette County carry any of the airport's insurance?

Answer: See preceding answer.

5. Does the County own and insure any dams?

Answer: Yes, Lake Noquebay and Shannon Lake.

If so, are any of them classified as high hazard?

Answer: The Shannon Lake is classified as high hazard, but a Lake District is being planned with the goal of accepting the dam from the County.

6. Is the County open to awarding specific lines of coverage to a new broker, the workers' compensation and/or the property/boiler for example?

Answer: Yes

7. The purpose of the RFP is to solicit a broker for consulting services related to soliciting quotes for the entire property/casualty insurance program. Having an experienced party handle the analysis of the various options is prudent given the complexity of analyzing the alternatives. Is the County open to continuing the consulting relationship, along with risk management services, should the final insurance placement warrant it?

Answer: Yes

8. Will the entity that receives the award for Insurance Consulting for Soliciting Quotes be precluded from bidding on placement of the County's Property & Casualty Insurance program which renews 1/1/16?

Answer: No, we will expect the entity will act in the best interest of the County.

9. Will bidding on the Consulting role, and subsequently not being selected, preclude an entity from then bidding on the placement of the County's Property & Casualty Insurance program which renews 1/1/16?

Answer: No

10. Is there a projected date of award for the Consulting agreement in order to fully prepare for the Soliciting of Quotes process for the 1/1/16 renewal?

Answer: September 29, 2015

11. What is the County's history of using an RFP for Consulting for Soliciting Quotes and/or bidding on placement of the County's Property & Casualty Insurance program?

Answer: I am unaware of the County using a consultant for at least the last 13 years.

12. Has the County determined an ideal term of service for this Consulting agreement – such as 1/1/16 renewal only, 3 year, 5 year, etc.?

Answer: No, the County is open to various terms of service options, but any bidder should provide a 1/1/16 renewal only proposal.