



January 24, 2022

**Addendum to**

**Contra Costa County's 2022 Request for Proposal:**

**RFP #2111-518**

*AB 109 Management of a Network System of Services*

**Response to Questions Received**



## Written Questions: RFP #2111-518

1. Will the County consider increasing the page limit and/or reducing formatting requirements to single-spacing? The RFP is asking for a substantial amount of information in each of the narrative prompts, and 15 pages double-spaced is not sufficient for comprehensive, detailed responses.

*The County has eliminated the Statement of Interest from the Project Narrative page limit of 15 double spaced pages. It is our belief that with this change, no additional changes to the formatting requirements are necessary. In light of this, the page number limits and double spacing will not change.*

2. Will the County consider exempting the unscored Statement of Interest (RFP page 24, bottom-third of page, and top of page 25) from the narrative page limit? This section is asking for a substantial amount of information that would further reduce the available page-space for proposers to address the scored sections of the narrative, which also ask for substantial amounts of information. If the unscored Statement of Interest is included in the narrative page limit, the County may receive unsatisfactory responses as proposers will want to reserve page-space for the sections that will be awarded points.

*The County agrees with the respondent's position and will exempt the Statement of Interest from the narrative page limit.*

3. The order of content in the Response Instructions (Section 6, beginning page 24) does not match the order of content in the Scoring Criteria (Section 7, beginning page 32). It is typical that the evaluators are instructed to use the Scoring Criteria when they evaluate each proposal, and proposers are advised to use the Scoring Criteria as a guide to ensure that their answers to each prompt are comprehensive. Please confirm that proposers should organize their Project Narratives according to the order of content presented in Section 6 Response Instructions and not Section 7 Scoring Criteria.

*Applicants should organize their Project Narratives according to the order of the content presented in Section 6: Response Instructions. Section 7: Scoring Criteria will be used by the review panel to evaluate content, not the order of the content. Any concerns surrounding confusion among the review panelists will be mitigated with review panel instructions.*

4. Will evaluators be informed/reminded that the narrative prompts in the Response Instructions ask for the proposal content in a different order than how it is presented in the Scoring Criteria? We are concerned that evaluators who are using the Scoring Criteria for their guide might deduct points from our proposal if they believe we presented the information in the wrong order, or that we put the narrative sections in the wrong places.

*The review panelists will not be evaluating the proposals on the order of the content, but on the content itself. This concern will be mitigated with review instructions for all panelists.*



*Panelists will also have copies of the RFP to review.*

5. On page 25, section 2.A.b. asks proposers to “identify the service intensity (direct service hours per week)” – is this service hours per week delivered to one client, or is this service hours per week delivered by the program as a whole?

*Determining service intensity should be based on the risk and need levels of the participant to be served and the activities that will be administered throughout the duration of the program. For example, if the program’s activities require participation by clients on an individual basis and the participant is determined to be of moderate risk and high level of need that your proposed program is structured to meet, then service intensity will account for the number of service hours per week per client to adequately address the participant’s need level. See more on intensity of service in APPENDIX A. Principles of Evidence-Based Services (pages 34-35) in the RFP.*

6. On page 25, section 2.A.b. asks proposers to identify “the total dosage of service (total direct hours of service provision)” – is this dosage of service per client, or dosage of service delivered by the program as a whole?

*Similar to intensity of service, determining dosage of service should be based on the risk and need levels of the participant to be served and the activities that will be administered throughout the duration of the program. For example, if the program’s activities require participation by clients on an individual basis and a participant is determined to be of moderate risk and high need that your program is structured to meet, then the dosage will account for the overall total number of hours per client throughout the duration of the client’s participation in the program. See more on intensity of service in APPENDIX A. Principles of Evidence-Based Services (pages 34-35) as well as in the Glossary of Terms in the RFP.*

7. Section 5. RFP Mandatory requirements specifies that electronic submissions are required from all proposers, however the forms require original, wet signatures in blue ink. How would the county like proposers to indicate the original signatures?

*In order to maintain original blue signatures in the electronic response, applicants should sign the original document in blue ink, then scan and download the document(s) to BidSync. The direct scan and download of the document will maintain the original blue signature. Please **DO NOT** utilize DocuSign for signatures as it is unclear whether DocuSign will maintain the blue ink.*

8. On page 30, Section V – CV/Resumes, the County requests job descriptions for positions that proposers will need to hire for. Does the County also want job descriptions for key staff?

*We are looking for job descriptions for key staff, including those positions that need to be*



*hired. Including resumes of existing key staff with a description of their role and responsibilities is also sufficient.*

9. In Section III-Budget Narratives the County limits the Narrative to 6 double-spaced pages. Does this page limit include both items 1. The Fiscal Management Information and 2. Budget narrative? Or just the Fiscal Management Information?

*The 6-page limit for Section III: Budget Narratives applies only to sub-section 2, budget narrative. The fiscal management information does not count toward the 6-page limit.*

10. Does a data-driven program include the use of the SAFE data shared system and program spread sheets used by agency to collect program data or is something else needed?

*Any contracted provider under this RFP will be required to use the county's shared data system, known as SAFE. With some flexibility and coordination with the ORJ, some aspects of program data may be entered into SAFE. However, we encourage you to use your agency's existing data infrastructure or system, if available, to track and monitor program indicators and outcomes. Other permissible alternatives include creating data tracking tools through Excel Spreadsheets or an Access Database to collect program data. Respondents are expected to assess their agency's data needs and plan for data collection and tracking activities throughout the duration of the contract.*

11. Are we to include a dollar amount for the SAFE license in the budget?

*No.*

12. Is the matching component (cost sharing) required?

*Matching is not required, however, encouraged. Preferential points of up to 5% of the final score will be added to the total overall score for Respondents including matching resources. See pages 26 and 28-30 of the Response Instructions, as well as the Scoring Sheet (page 33) and Glossary of Terms (page 43) of the RFP.*