

**CITY OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY HEALTH SURVEY DATA COLLECTION (2015-2020)
PIN: 14LL000300R0X00**

**Addendum No. 1
July 31, 2013**

Except as otherwise stated below to the above referenced Request for Proposal (“RFP”), which was released on June 28, 2013, the RFP remains unchanged:

I. Acknowledgement of Addenda

Please acknowledge receipt of this addendum by completing and submitting ATTACHMENT D, “Acknowledgement of Addenda - Revised” (see attached form), with your proposal package.

II. Questions and Answers.

Below are answers to questions received by the Agency by the Questions Due Date:

1. Question: Can you make the actual final disposition reports (and correlating quota reports) available for each of the last 2 years of data collection?

Answer: Final disposition reports are available online on Epi Query:
<http://www.nyc.gov/html/doh/downloads/pdf/episrv/CHS-2009-2011-dispo-reports.pdf>

2. Question: Since this is a government proposal, can you furnish us with the previous winning proposal (assuming it should be a matter of public record)?

Answer: DOHMH is not able to provide the previous proposal.

3. Question: If we encounter a non-English speaking respondent that does not speak Russian, Spanish or Chinese does that make them ineligible?

Answer: If a household is reached and no one is able to answer the screening/eligibility questions in one of the languages used for the survey, the household is assigned a final disposition status of “unknown eligibility”. If someone in the household is able to answer screening/eligibility questions but the selected respondent cannot speak one of the interview languages, that respondent is assigned as “ineligible”.

4. Question: The project description speaks in terms of “minimums” (i.e. minimum of 8500 interviews). How many landline and how many cell phone interviews were actually completed in the last 3 years on a per year basis?

- Answer: The CHS has moved toward an allocation of landline and cell phone completes that represents the relative proportion of the different phone groups within the population. However, the allocation of completes from each frame is also subject to funding, specifically if screening is done for households that are cell phone only. 2010 – 6% cell phone completes; 2011 – 14% cell phone completes; 2012 – 19% cell phone completes.
5. Question: What kind of cell phone sample has been used in previous waves? Was there any cleansing process used in order to target more productive and active cell phone numbers? If not, was this because these techniques were not yet available, or because the preference is a pure EPSOM cell phone sampling? Have you used an EPSOM LL RDD sample each year under the previous contract, or did you use a weighted LL RDD sample?
- Answer: Cell phone sample was purchased from Survey Sampling International and is an EPSEM citywide sample. The landline sample frame is defined by exchanged in listed 1 + banks plus Cablevision exchanges with 0 listed numbers in 100-banks from 1000-banks with 1+ listed numbers. The landline sample is pre-screened to remove out-of-scope numbers and remaining numbers are assigned to replicates and is EPSEM by borough.
6. Question: Over the last 3 years, the ratio of cellphones to landlines has dramatically changes, yet your targets still reflect 15%. Has this increase in cellphone vs. landline been taken into account for the 2015-2020 data collection?
- Answer: Yes. A total of 1,200 cell phone completes (15%) is only a minimum. As stated in the answer to question 4, the CHS has moved toward an allocation that represents the relative proportion of each group in the population and that will likely continue.
7. Question: Pg. 20 of the RFP, section 2.1.8 specifies that at least two letters of reference should be supplied. Can you please clarify whether letters are required or if only contact information needs to be provided?
- Answer: Contact information along with the letters of reference is being requested. References may be contacted during the review process.
8. Question: May proposers include references from NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene personnel?
- Answer: Proposers may not use references from the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.
9. Question: Attachment B, “Deliverable Six—Lab analysis,” specifies an average cost of \$30 per participant for laboratory analysis. Should this cost per participant for laboratory analysis be included in the vendor’s budget?
- Answer : Yes, include laboratory costs in the budget.

