

ADDENDUM # 4

MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

December 8, 2015

Address all questions to:
Kelly Wilhelm, Senior Procurement Analyst
Multnomah County Purchasing
501 SE Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 125
Portland, OR 97214
503-988-3426
kelly.wilhelm@multco.us

RFPQ NO: 4000003199
TITLE: SUN Service System
CLOSING DATE: December 21, 2015 / NOT LATER THAN 4:00 P.M.

This Addendum is issued to the above referenced RFP to make the following changes, additions, deletions, and/or clarifications.

RFP ADDENDA	
1. ADDITION	<p>SECTION 1.2 – PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE, PAGE 4</p> <p>Add the attached Pre-Proposal Conference Attendance List as Attachment 1 to Addendum #4.</p>
2. CLARIFICATION	<p>SECTION 2.8.7 PRE-CONTRACT VENDOR ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY REVIEW, Page 22</p> <p>QUESTION: How much more funding may be expected for culturally specific services; e.g., if additional funds were available, we could expand the number of children served, and are considering partnering with another culturally specific provider to serve those additional numbers. Or, in another scenario, if we are selected as the sole proprietor for culturally specific services and over the course of our contract decide that it would be beneficial to partner with another community group who provides culturally specific services targeted to that population, would we be able to propose adding a subcontractor, based on need and negotiations with the county?</p> <p>ANSWER: We cannot anticipate future funding for any services. If, outside of this solicitation, an organization wants to subcontract some/all of its funds, the County must approve any such arrangement as addressed in the RFP Section 2.8.7.</p>
3. CLARIFICATION	<p>SECTION 3.1 WRITTEN EVALUATION PROCESS – STEP 1, Page 27</p> <p>QUESTION: Will reviewers be reviewing the entire proposal or only sections of proposals (i.e. will sections of the proposal be parceled out to different reviewers)?</p> <p>ANSWER: Raters will review and rate whole proposal.</p>

<p>4. CLARIFICATION</p>	<p>ELECTRONIC SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT “LINE ITEM BUDGET FORM” (REFERENCED IN SOLICITATION ATTACHMENTS: 2,3 & 4)</p> <p>QUESTION: Where should food costs be placed? What about other materials or supplies that don't fall under the listed categories?</p> <p>ANSWER: Applicants should determine the best materials and services category in which to put food costs. We don't prescribe a particular category from the list. Applicants are urged to be consistent when scribing costs to the various materials and services categories.</p> <p>QUESTION: Can salaries for Data/Evaluation staff members be included as direct program costs for any SUN services? Given the extensive data collection and evaluation required, we weren't sure if that qualified them as direct costs?</p> <p>ANSWER: Data entry staff can only be charged as direct program costs for entering data into ServicePoint or OPUS for the programs funded through the SUN Service System. Data entry into an agency's own system is not considered a direct program cost. Evaluation staff are not considered direct program costs.</p>
<p>5. CLARIFICATION</p>	<p>SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT 8 - ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS ESTIMATES FOR ALL SERVICES, last page</p> <p>QUESTION: You clarified the breakdown of MSI Assertive Engagement Services vs MSI Client Flex Funds for Regions in Addendum #3, but we could not find such a breakdown for Culturally Specific services. Could you please clarify how we should craft those budget expenses for Culturally Specific services?</p> <p>ANSWER: MSI funding breakdown for Culturally Specific services is part of Addendum #2., Clarification #20.</p>
<p>6. CLARIFICATION</p>	<p>GENERAL QUESTION: SERVICE ALLOCATION FACTORS – CLARIFICATION ITEM#30 IN ADDENDUM #2</p> <p>QUESTION: When we are applying for MSI in culturally specific services; does the total allocation include client assistance?</p> <p>ANSWER: Yes it does. The table issued as attachment in Addendum #2 breaks out the total MSI award in to 2 categories: assertive engagement services and client flex funds. Proposers are required to budget MSI funds according to these two categories, and must use all of the client flex funds as such in their program delivery.</p>
<p>7. CLARIFICATION</p>	<p>GENERAL QUESTION</p> <p>QUESTION: Are energy funds available for clients?</p> <p>ANSWER: Yes there are. Energy funds outlined in the RFP are just for program delivery, organizations awarded will have a separate allocation for Client Vendor Payment amounts that are drawn down in order to pay client energy bills.</p> <p>QUESTION: For energy, funds are just for the running of the program, administration costs?</p> <p>ANSWER: Yes</p>

8. CLARIFICATION	GENERAL QUESTION QUESTION: Regions 1 and 2 are being reconfigured. Some African and Asian immigrant families in what will now be Region 2 are currently being provided services by an organization that has the capacity to provide those culturally specific services; if that organization is selected as a Region 1 provider, will they be able to use their Region 1 funding to continue to serve those families who are now within Region 2--consistent with the county's "no wrong door" policy? In other words, they would continue to provide services to families within our region, using their own regional county funds? Or would those families have to travel out of our region to receive their services? ANSWER: Yes, they can continue to receive services from their existing service provider, should they continue to want this.
9. CLARIFICATION	GENERAL QUESTION QUESTION: Is there is an annual COLA addressed in RFP? Is there going to be an annual adjustment, and should we represent this in the budget? ANSWER: An annual COLA is not addressed in the RFP. Proposers should plan their budgets using the amounts presented in the RFP.
10. CLARIFICATION	GENERAL QUESTION QUESTION: Can you confirm if there are any requirements related to grant writing style having to be "in the 3rd person"? ANSWER: There is no such requirement.

c: P. Samolinski, J. Fraser
K.Wilhelm, T.Steele

File