

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
ADDENDUM # 3

ISSUED: August 10, 2009

RFP NUMBER: CSP902810  
INDEX NUMBER: JFS001K  
UNSPSC CODE: 60105410

The state of Ohio, through the Department of Administrative Services, Office of Procurement Services, for the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services and the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, on behalf of the Governors Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, is requesting proposals for:

**Family Reentry Program**

Reason for Addendum: This Addendum is issued to notify Offeror's that page 14, item number 4, is deleted due to a duplication of item 3 and the other technical requirements have been renumbered. Replace pages 14 through 17 with the attached pages.

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: September 4, 2009 at 1:00 p.m.

OPENING LOCATION: Department of Administrative Services  
Office of Procurement Services  
4200 Surface Rd.  
Columbus, OH 43228-1395

<p>3. Capabilities/Competencies (Capabilities, demonstration productivity, and experience of applicants):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Describe your organization’s capacity to undertake this work based on a demonstrated history of doing related work. This should include: the extent to which it described how the organization is well positioned to support the project and how the proposed project fits into the structure of the applicant organization. The Offeror should provide evidence of facilities, fiscal controls and other resources that are adequate to achieve project goals. The applicant must address the issue of how its overall organization is positioned to support this project, and how this project may impact other activities, which the organization plans to undertake. The Offeror should be physically located in the geographic area they proposed to serve.</li> <li>b. The Offeror shall describe its project management structure and staffing. The Offeror’s Proposal will be evaluated on the extent to which it includes a listing of key positions required to carry out the Project, the individuals proposed to fill the positions, and a detailed description of the kind of work they will perform. The Offeror’s Proposal will be evaluated on the extent to which evidence is provided demonstrating the staff’s skill, knowledge, and experience in carrying out their assigned activities such as evidence that demonstrates not only staff’s good technical skills, but also a clear record of working with faith-based and community organizations.</li> <li>c. Describe the adequacy of the plan to manage the project, including how various tasks are subdivided and resources are used.</li> <li>d. Provide information describing successful past performance on grants and contracts.</li> </ul>	15	
<p>4. Results and Benefits Expected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Describe the anticipated measureable effects of the Project, level of impact, number served, etc.</li> <li>b. Describe the relationship between Project activities and anticipated outcomes.</li> <li>c. Provide a complete Logic Model for the proposed Project Work Plan.</li> </ul>	10	
<p>5. Restrictions on Inherently Religious Activities: The proposal clearly states that the funds from this Project will not be used to support inherently religious activities such as religious instruction, worship, or proselytization. Further, organizations will take steps to separate, in time or locations, their inherently religious activities from the ODRC/GOFBCI funded services. Offerors must describe this issue</p>	5	
<p>6. Offerors have attached all required Memorandum of Understandings as outlined under Part One: Work Requirements which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Collaborative partners and/or sub-grantees (subcontractors).</li> <li>b. The partnering Ohio Department of Rehabilitation institution.</li> <li>c. The partnering housing partner(s).</li> <li>d. Those agencies you are leveraging resources.</li> <li>e. The Domestic Violence provider for your project.</li> </ul>	10	
<p>7. Cost Summary detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The predominance of funding is for project-related costs, with a minimal amount dedicated for administrative costs.</li> <li>b. The budget presentation is clear and detailed, and justifies funding uses.</li> <li>c. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.</li> <li>d. Applicants have provided a plan for project continuance beyond the duration of the grant support.</li> </ul>	10	

475 points are attainable by scoring 5 (“greatly exceeds”) points, multiplied by corresponding weight, for each of the items in the Technical requirements, Table 2.

Once the technical merits of the Proposal have been evaluated, the committee will rank the proposals. The evaluation committee will rank the Proposals by multiplying the score received in each category by its assigned weight and adding all categories together for the Offeror’s total technical score. The scoring values shown, 0 through 5, are targets for each category. The actual number values awarded may be higher or lower (not lower than 0 or higher than 5) based on the evaluation committee’s determination.

Once the technical merits of a Proposal are considered, the costs of that Proposal will be considered. It is within the State’s discretion to wait to factor in a Proposal’s cost until after any interviews, presentations, demonstrations or discussions. Also, before evaluating the technical merits of the Proposals, the State may do an initial review of costs to determine if any Proposals should be rejected because of excessive cost. The State may reconsider the excessiveness of any Proposal’s cost at any time in the evaluation process.

**COST POINTS CALCULATION.** The Offeror's cost points are calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Cost points} = (\text{lowest Offeror's cost} / \text{Offeror's cost}) \times 100 \text{ possible Cost Points (Attachment 9A).}$$

The number of points assigned to the cost evaluation will be prorated, with the lowest accepted cost proposal given the maximum number of points possible for this criterion. Other acceptable cost proposals will be scored as the ratio of the lowest price proposal to the proposal being scored, multiplied by the maximum number of points possible for this criterion.

**TOTAL POINTS.** The Offeror with the highest point total from all phases of the evaluation (Technical Merit Points + Cost Points) will be recommended for the next phase of the evaluation. If the committee finds that one or more Proposals should be given further consideration, the committee may select one or more of the highest scoring Proposals to move to the next phase. The committee may alternatively choose to bypass any or all subsequent phases and make an award based solely on the evaluation phase.

**TABLE 3 – COMBINED SCORES**

The values for technical and cost points will be calculated and applied to Table 3.

CRITERIA	POSSIBLE POINTS	ACTUAL POINTS
TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	475	
COST	100	
TOTAL	575	

**SELECTION PROCESS.** This RFP asks for responses and submissions from Offerors, most of which represent components of the above criteria. While each criterion represents only a part of the total basis for a decision to award the Contract to an Offeror, a failure by an Offeror to make a required submission or meet a mandatory requirement will normally result in a rejection of that Offeror's Proposal. The value assigned above to each criterion is only a value used to determine which Proposal is the most advantageous to the State in relation to the other Proposals that the State received. It is not a basis for determining the importance of meeting any requirement to participate in the Proposal process.

If the State does not receive any Proposals that meet all the mandatory requirements, the State may cancel this RFP. Alternatively, if the committee believes it is in the State's interest, the State may evaluate the Proposals despite their failure to meet all the mandatory requirements. In doing this, the State may consider one or more of the highest-ranking Proposals. The State may not consider any lower-ranking Proposals unless all Proposals ranked above it are also considered, except as provided below.

**FINANCIAL ABILITY.** Part of the Proposal evaluation criteria is the qualifications of the Offeror which include, as a component, the Offeror's financial ability to perform the Contract. This RFP may expressly require the submission of financial statements from all Offerors in the Proposal contents attachment. If the Proposal does not make this an expressed requirement, the State may still insist that an Offeror submit reviewed or audited financial statements for up to the past three (3) years if the State is concerned that an Offeror may not have the financial ability to carry out the Contract.

In evaluating an Offeror's financial ability, the weight the State assigns, if any, to that financial ability will depend on whether the Offeror's financial position is adequate or inadequate. That is, if the Offeror's financial ability is adequate, the value assigned to the Offeror's relative financial ability in relation to other Offerors may or may not be significant, depending on the nature of the Work. If the State believes the Offeror's financial ability is not adequate, the State may reject the Proposal despite its other merits.

**DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIBILITY.** The State may review the highest-ranking Offeror or its key team members to ensure that the Offeror is responsible. The Contract may not be awarded to an Offeror that is determined not to be responsible. The State's determination of an Offeror's responsibility may include the following factors: the experience of the Offeror and its key team members; past conduct and past performance on previous contracts; ability to execute this contract properly; and management skill. The State will make such determination of responsibility based on the Offeror's Proposal, reference evaluations, and any other information the State requests or determines to be relevant.

**INTERVIEWS, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND PRESENTATIONS.** The State may require top Offerors to be interviewed. Such presentations, demonstrations, and interviews will provide an Offeror with an opportunity to clarify its Proposal and to ensure a mutual understanding of the Proposal's content. This will also allow the State an opportunity to test or probe the professionalism, qualifications, skills, and work knowledge of the proposed candidates. The presentations, demonstrations,

and interviews will be scheduled at the convenience and discretion of the State. The State may record any presentations, demonstrations, and interviews.

The State normally will not rank interviews, demonstrations, and presentations. Rather, the State may decide to revise its existing proposal evaluations based on the interviews, demonstrations, and/or presentations.

CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS. The final phase of the evaluation process may be contract negotiations. It is entirely within the discretion of the State whether to permit negotiations. An Offeror must not submit a Proposal assuming that there will be an opportunity to negotiate any aspect of the Proposal. The State is free to limit negotiations to particular aspects of any Proposal, to limit the Offerors with whom the State wants to negotiate, and to dispense with negotiations entirely. Negotiations will be scheduled at the convenience of the State. The selected Offeror(s) are expected to negotiate in good faith.

Negotiations may be conducted with any Offeror who submits a competitive Proposal, but the State may limit discussions to specific aspects of the RFP. Any clarifications, corrections, or negotiated revisions that may occur during the negotiations phase will be reduced to writing and incorporated in the RFP or the Offeror's Proposal, as appropriate. Any Offeror whose response continues to be competitive will be accorded fair and equal treatment with respect to any clarification, correction, or revision of the RFP and will be given the opportunity to negotiate revisions to its Proposal based on the amended RFP. Should the evaluation process have resulted in a top-ranked Proposal, the State may limit negotiations to only that Offeror and not hold negotiations with any lower-ranking Offeror. If negotiations are unsuccessful with the top-ranked Offeror, the State may then go down the line of remaining Offerors, according to rank, and negotiate with the next highest-ranking Offeror. Lower-ranking Offerors do not have a right to participate in negotiations conducted in such a manner.

If the State decides to negotiate with all the remaining Offerors, or decides that negotiations with the top-ranked Offeror are not satisfactory and negotiates with one or more of the lower-ranking Offerors, the State will then determine if an adjustment in the ranking of the remaining Offerors is appropriate based on the negotiations. The Contract award, if any, will then be based on the final ranking of Offerors, as adjusted.

Auction techniques that reveal one Offeror's price to another or disclose any other material information derived from competing Proposals are prohibited. Any oral modification of a Proposal will be reduced to writing by the Offeror as described below.

Following negotiations, the State may set a date and time for the submission of best and final Proposals by the remaining Offeror(s) with which the State conducted negotiations. If negotiations were limited and all changes were reduced to signed writings during negotiations, the State need not require the submissions of best and final Proposals.

If best and final Proposals are required they may be submitted only once, unless the State makes a written determination that it is in the State's interest to conduct additional negotiations. In such cases, the State may require another submission of best and final Proposals. Otherwise, discussion of or changes in the best and final Proposals will not be allowed. If an Offeror does not submit a best and final Proposal, the Offeror's previous Proposal will be considered the Offeror's best and final Proposal.

The State generally will not rank negotiations. The negotiations will normally be held to correct deficiencies in the preferred Offeror's Proposal. If negotiations fail with the preferred Offeror, the State may negotiate with the next Offeror in ranking. Alternatively, the State may decide that it is in the interests of the State to negotiate with all the remaining Offerors to determine if negotiations lead to an adjustment in the ranking of the remaining Offerors.

From the opening of the Proposals to the award of the Contract, everyone working on behalf of the State to evaluate the Proposals will seek to limit access to information contained in the Proposals solely to those people with a need to know the information. They will also seek to keep this information away from other Offerors, and the evaluation committee will not be allowed to tell one Offeror about the contents of another Offeror's Proposal in order to gain a negotiating advantage.

Before the award of the Contract or cancellation of the RFP, any Offeror that seeks to gain access to the contents of another Offeror's Proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

FAILURE TO NEGOTIATE. If an Offeror fails to provide the necessary information for negotiations in a timely manner, or fails to negotiate in good faith, the State may terminate negotiations with that Offeror and collect on the Offeror's bid bond, if a bid bond was required in order to respond to this RFP.

This page left blank.