

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

In addition to the specific changes detailed below, dates, contact information, page numbers and minor formatting and wording have changed throughout.

Section	Text	Comment																				
Cover Letter	<p>William Porter (916) 449-5457 California Department of Public Health, 1616 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814</p>	Contact information updated																				
I.A.2. Key Action Dates	<p style="text-align: center;">Table 1.1 Key Action Dates</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="422 597 982 646">ACTIVITY</th> <th data-bbox="982 597 1633 646">ACTION DATE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 646 982 686">Solicitation release date</td> <td data-bbox="982 646 1633 686">February 24, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 686 982 727">Mandatory Bidders Conference</td> <td data-bbox="982 686 1633 727">March 15, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 727 982 768">Written question submittal deadline</td> <td data-bbox="982 727 1633 768">March 18, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 768 982 808">Questions and Answers posted</td> <td data-bbox="982 768 1633 808">March 25, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 808 982 849">Final date for proposal submission</td> <td data-bbox="982 808 1633 849">April 22, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 849 982 889">Interviews</td> <td data-bbox="982 849 1633 889">Received by CDPH no later than 5 pm May 16 – 27, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 889 982 930">Negotiations (if necessary)</td> <td data-bbox="982 889 1633 930">May 30 – June 10, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 930 982 971">Proposed award date</td> <td data-bbox="982 930 1633 971">July 1, 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 971 982 1011">Contract start date</td> <td data-bbox="982 971 1633 1011">August 1, 2016</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ACTIVITY	ACTION DATE	Solicitation release date	February 24, 2016	Mandatory Bidders Conference	March 15, 2016	Written question submittal deadline	March 18, 2016	Questions and Answers posted	March 25, 2016	Final date for proposal submission	April 22, 2016	Interviews	Received by CDPH no later than 5 pm May 16 – 27, 2016	Negotiations (if necessary)	May 30 – June 10, 2016	Proposed award date	July 1, 2016	Contract start date	August 1, 2016	Revised schedule
ACTIVITY	ACTION DATE																					
Solicitation release date	February 24, 2016																					
Mandatory Bidders Conference	March 15, 2016																					
Written question submittal deadline	March 18, 2016																					
Questions and Answers posted	March 25, 2016																					
Final date for proposal submission	April 22, 2016																					
Interviews	Received by CDPH no later than 5 pm May 16 – 27, 2016																					
Negotiations (if necessary)	May 30 – June 10, 2016																					
Proposed award date	July 1, 2016																					
Contract start date	August 1, 2016																					
I.A.2. Key Action Dates	<p>* Mandatory Bidders Conference: March 15, 2016, 1 pm California Department of Public Health 1616 Capitol Ave Sacramento, CA 2nd floor, Room 260: Russian Room</p> <p>Only entities that attend the Bidders Conference will be eligible to submit an application. Entities that do not attend the Bidders Conference will be ruled administratively non-compliant and their submission will not be reviewed.</p>	<p>Updated time and location information.</p> <p>Update Bidders Conference to mandatory</p>																				

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment
I.A.9. Cal eProcure	This bid and associated documents are available on Cal eProcure, a website the State of California uses to publicly post solicitations. While users may register for Cal eProcure, it is not necessary to access these documents.	Update to reflect state's new procurement portal
I.A.11. Optional Letter of Intent	<p>Potential applicants are encouraged to send a letter of intent to CDPH, using the contact information provided in I.A.7. Letters should be postmarked by September 21, 2015 and should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Name and number of Solicitation ▪ Population targeted ▪ Budget request (approximate) ▪ Short description of project <p>Letters of intent are not binding. Those submitting a letter may elect not to submit an application.</p>	A letter of intent is no longer requested
II.A. Overview	<p>The Native American TA Provider will directly support the Native American Capacity Building Pilot Projects (CBPPs) and the Native American Implementation Pilot Projects (IPPs). The TA Provider is expected to coordinate and work closely with the Statewide Evaluator, the Statewide and Local Education, Outreach and Awareness Consultants and CDPH staff to support the success of the Native American Pilot Projects and the CRDP as a whole.</p> <p>We anticipate pilot projects will primarily be community-based organizations (CBOs). In addition, some tribal or local government entities (e.g., school districts) that directly provide CDEP services to the Native American population or subpopulations may be awarded Pilot Project Grants. CBPPs are intended to allow those CDEPs that do not have a history of successfully obtaining grants, but nonetheless have established successful CDEPs, an opportunity to participate in CRDP Phase 2.</p>	Updated to reflect lack of Native American CBPPs
II.A. Overview	<p>The Native American TA Provider will support the CRDP pilot projects through two stages: <u>Stage One: Capacity Building (March – October, 2016)</u> There is no need for Native American TA services in Stage One because there were no applicants for Native American Capacity Building Pilot Projects.</p>	Updated to reflect lack of Native American CBPPs

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment
II.B. Proposer-Defined Deliverables	<p><i>Deliverables 8, 9, 10 deleted.</i></p> <p><i>Subsequent deliverables renumbered to reflect change.</i></p>	<p>Updated to reflect lack of Native American CBPPs</p> <p>Changes are made throughout the document to reflect numbering change.</p>
II.B. Proposer-Defined Deliverables	<p>Deliverable 8: IPP Assessment</p> <p>Early in the Implementation stage, the Native American TA Provider shall provide a written assessment of each Native American IPP’s organizational strengths and limitations in effectively and efficiently providing its CDEP. For CBPPs that have advanced to IPP status, this assessment will be broader than the CBPP assessment, which was focused on steps needed to advance to IPP status. We expect this to be a collaborative process, through which the Native American TA Provider and the IPP will work to identify any current gaps. Each IPP and the Native American TA Provider will mutually agree upon an Action Plan that will satisfy the needs of the IPP process.</p>	<p>Updated to reflect lack of Native American CBPPs</p>

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment
II.B. Proposer-Defined Deliverables	<p>Deliverable 10: IPP Technical Assistance and Training</p> <p>The Contractor shall develop individualized, in-depth, introductory-level training programs and/or technical assistance to address the needs outlined in each individual IPP assessment. The Proposer shall specify how it proposes to deliver the training, including the format of the trainings (i.e. in person, via webinar, or other), the structure of the trainings (i.e. individual, small groups or large groups), as well as the duration of each training session. In person, individual trainings are preferred, however, the Proposer must account for the cost of travel in its bid. For any structure other than in person trainings, the Proposer shall detail how its proposal fully meets the needs of the project. Budgeting must adhere to state travel reimbursement policy, available here: http://www.calhr.ca.gov/employees/Pages/travel-reimbursements.aspx. Pilot Projects will be located across the state.</p> <p>The Native American TA Provider shall provide ongoing technical assistance throughout the funding period. This will include ad hoc assistance as needs arise. The Proposer shall detail how it will make its staff available for ad hoc assistance, including the format and time commitment. In addition, it shall entail providing ongoing feedback and support to ensure that all capacity building elements addressed in Deliverable 8 are successfully completed. This deliverable shall include, but is not limited to, a combination of planned review and feedback encounters, as well as providing other types of support on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>The Proposer shall also list all training faculty and their qualifications to provide training and technical assistance in a linguistically and culturally competent manner. Moreover, the Proposer shall specify how it plans to validate whether the IPP has fulfilled the planned growth and development.</p>	Clarification
II.B. Proposer-Defined Deliverables	<p>Deliverable 12: CRDP Phase 2 Pilot Project Evaluation Population Guidelines and Support</p> <p>...</p> <p>It is anticipated that there will be a tension between the need to balance specific, uniform guidelines with flexibility to allow IPPs to evaluate their programs in the most appropriate manner for their community. The Proposer should detail how it proposes to balance these conflicting needs, including how this will be informed by its experience working with California's Native American populations.</p>	Clarification
III.B. Desired Qualifications	<p>Scoring of Proposer qualifications will be based on the following criteria and will include all key staff and subcontractors:</p>	Clarification

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment
IV.D. Preferred Method for Delivery	<p>A Proposer may deliver a proposal by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Mail (1616 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814) ▪ Hand delivery (1616 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814) ▪ Courier service (1616 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814) 	Clarification
V.B. Proposal Scoring	<p>Stage Three: Scoring of In-Person Interview (60 points of total score) The three proposals with the highest scores in Stage Two will be invited to conduct an in-person interview. If three proposals do not attain the required minimum score to advance, only those that do will be invited to conduct an interview. The interview will be conducted in Sacramento and is anticipated to take two hours. All key team members are required to attend. The interview will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Proposer’s background and qualifications to provide the services required in a culturally and linguistically competent manner ▪ How the Workplan is designed to meet the unique needs of the target populations and to effectively work with Pilot Projects implementing community participatory evaluations through methods that are deemed appropriate and effective within their communities ▪ Clarification of up to three points within the proposal <p>Proposals must attain a minimum score of 160 total possible points in Stage Three to continue to Stage Four.</p> <p>Stage Four: Scoring of Cost Proposal (100 points of total score)</p>	Interview added

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment
V.D. Scoring Criteria	<p>The maximum point values for the following sections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Technical Proposal 160 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposer and Personnel Qualifications 60 points 2. Population Letters of Support 20 points 3. References 20 points 4. Approach and Workplan 30 points 5. Proposer-Defined Deliverables 30 points ii. Interview 60 points iii. Cost Proposal 100 points 	<p>Updated to reflect addition of interview</p> <p>Changes are made throughout the document to reflect this.</p>

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment												
V.D. Scoring Criteria	The Letters of Support will be scored in accordance with the following standards:	Simplify and clarify scoring												
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="338 358 982 412" style="text-align: center;">Proposer Qualifications (Mandatory)</th> <th data-bbox="982 358 1619 412" style="text-align: center;">Pass/Fail</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="338 412 982 466">Three (3) Letters of Support</td> <td data-bbox="982 412 1619 466"></td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="338 466 982 519" style="text-align: center;">Proposer Qualifications (Desirable)</th> <th data-bbox="982 466 1619 519" style="text-align: center;">Maximum Score</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="338 519 982 708">Letter validates experience working with Native American population and subpopulations in California and provides understanding of customer value for a sustained period of time</td> <td data-bbox="982 519 1619 708" style="text-align: center;">10 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="338 708 982 829">Letter documents impact of specific works and/or projects on California's Native American population</td> <td data-bbox="982 708 1619 829" style="text-align: center;">10 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="338 829 982 948">Total</td> <td data-bbox="982 829 1619 948" style="text-align: center;">20 points (Average of 3 references, rounded to nearest whole number)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Proposer Qualifications (Mandatory)	Pass/Fail	Three (3) Letters of Support		Proposer Qualifications (Desirable)	Maximum Score	Letter validates experience working with Native American population and subpopulations in California and provides understanding of customer value for a sustained period of time	10 points	Letter documents impact of specific works and/or projects on California's Native American population	10 points	Total	20 points (Average of 3 references, rounded to nearest whole number)
	Proposer Qualifications (Mandatory)		Pass/Fail											
	Three (3) Letters of Support													
	Proposer Qualifications (Desirable)		Maximum Score											
	Letter validates experience working with Native American population and subpopulations in California and provides understanding of customer value for a sustained period of time		10 points											
Letter documents impact of specific works and/or projects on California's Native American population	10 points													
Total	20 points (Average of 3 references, rounded to nearest whole number)													

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment												
V.D. Scoring Criteria	<p>The References will be scored in accordance with the following standards:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="348 358 1621 950"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="348 358 984 412">Reference (Mandatory)</th> <th data-bbox="984 358 1621 412">Pass/Fail</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="348 412 984 500">Three (3) References for work similar in size and scope</td> <td data-bbox="984 412 1621 500"></td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="348 500 984 553">Reference (Desirable)</th> <th data-bbox="984 500 1621 553">Maximum Score</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="348 553 984 675">Reference demonstrates Proposers' ability to effectively fulfill a contract to provide TA services, on time and on budget.</td> <td data-bbox="984 553 1621 675">10 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="348 675 984 829">Reference demonstrates Proposers' history and deep experience working with California's Native American population in a culturally and linguistically appropriate manner.</td> <td data-bbox="984 675 1621 829">10 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="348 829 984 950">Total</td> <td data-bbox="984 829 1621 950">20 points (Average of 3 references, rounded to nearest whole number)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Reference (Mandatory)	Pass/Fail	Three (3) References for work similar in size and scope		Reference (Desirable)	Maximum Score	Reference demonstrates Proposers' ability to effectively fulfill a contract to provide TA services, on time and on budget.	10 points	Reference demonstrates Proposers' history and deep experience working with California's Native American population in a culturally and linguistically appropriate manner.	10 points	Total	20 points (Average of 3 references, rounded to nearest whole number)	Simplify and clarify scoring
Reference (Mandatory)	Pass/Fail													
Three (3) References for work similar in size and scope														
Reference (Desirable)	Maximum Score													
Reference demonstrates Proposers' ability to effectively fulfill a contract to provide TA services, on time and on budget.	10 points													
Reference demonstrates Proposers' history and deep experience working with California's Native American population in a culturally and linguistically appropriate manner.	10 points													
Total	20 points (Average of 3 references, rounded to nearest whole number)													
V.D. Scoring Criteria	<p style="text-align: center;">Table 5.1 Workplan Scoring</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="348 1019 1621 1138"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="348 1019 606 1057"></th> <th data-bbox="606 1019 842 1057">Outstanding</th> <th data-bbox="842 1019 1100 1057">Good</th> <th data-bbox="1100 1019 1316 1057">Fair</th> <th data-bbox="1316 1019 1621 1057">Poor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="348 1057 606 1138">Workplan (30 Points)</td> <td data-bbox="606 1057 842 1138">30 Points</td> <td data-bbox="842 1057 1100 1138">23 Points</td> <td data-bbox="1100 1057 1316 1138">15 Points</td> <td data-bbox="1316 1057 1621 1138">0 Points</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Workplan (30 Points)	30 Points	23 Points	15 Points	0 Points	Clarification		
	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor										
Workplan (30 Points)	30 Points	23 Points	15 Points	0 Points										
V.B. Proposal Scoring	<p>Deliverable 8: IPP Assessment (5 points) Deliverable 9: IPP TA and Training Plan (5 points) Deliverable 10: IPP Technical Assistance and Training (10 points) Deliverable 11: Cross-Population Technical Assistance and Training (3 points) Deliverable 12: CRDP Phase 2 Pilot Project Evaluation Population Guidelines and Support (4 points) Deliverable 13: Final Convening (3 points)</p>	Updated to reflect lack of Native American CBPPs												

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment																																			
V.B. Proposal Scoring	Table 5.2 Deliverables Scoring	Updated to reflect lack of Native American CBPPs																																			
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center; color: red;">Outstanding</th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center; color: red;">Good</th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center; color: red;">Fair</th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center; color: red;">Poor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Deliverable 8: IPP Assessment (5 points)</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">5 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">4 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">2 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deliverable 9: IPP TA and Training Plan (5 points)</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">5 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">4 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">2 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deliverable 10: IPP Technical Assistance and Training (10 points)</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">10 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">8 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">5 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deliverable 11: Cross-Population Technical Assistance and Training (3 points)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 Point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deliverable 12: CRDP Phase 2 Pilot Project Evaluation Population Guidelines and Support (4 points)</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">4 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">3 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">1 Point</td> <td style="text-align: center; color: red;">0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deliverable 13: Final Convening (3 points)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 Points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 Point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0 Points</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Deliverable 8: IPP Assessment (5 points)	5 Points	4 Points	2 Points	0 Points	Deliverable 9: IPP TA and Training Plan (5 points)	5 Points	4 Points	2 Points	0 Points	Deliverable 10: IPP Technical Assistance and Training (10 points)	10 Points	8 Points	5 Points	0 Points	Deliverable 11: Cross-Population Technical Assistance and Training (3 points)	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	0 Points	Deliverable 12: CRDP Phase 2 Pilot Project Evaluation Population Guidelines and Support (4 points)	4 Points	3 Points	1 Point	0 Points	Deliverable 13: Final Convening (3 points)	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	0 Points
			Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor																															
	Deliverable 8: IPP Assessment (5 points)		5 Points	4 Points	2 Points	0 Points																															
	Deliverable 9: IPP TA and Training Plan (5 points)		5 Points	4 Points	2 Points	0 Points																															
	Deliverable 10: IPP Technical Assistance and Training (10 points)		10 Points	8 Points	5 Points	0 Points																															
	Deliverable 11: Cross-Population Technical Assistance and Training (3 points)		3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	0 Points																															
	Deliverable 12: CRDP Phase 2 Pilot Project Evaluation Population Guidelines and Support (4 points)		4 Points	3 Points	1 Point	0 Points																															
Deliverable 13: Final Convening (3 points)	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	0 Points																																	

California Reducing Disparities Project (CRDP) Phase 2 Technical Assistance Provider, Native American

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment
V.B. Proposal Scoring	<p>Scoring of In-Person Interview Interview (60 points)</p> <p>The interview will be scored</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Proposer’s background and qualifications to provide the services required in a culturally and linguistically competent manner ▪ How the Workplan is designed to meet the unique needs of the target populations and to effectively work with Pilot Projects implementing community participatory evaluations through methods that are deemed appropriate and effective within their communities ▪ Clarification of up to three components within the proposal 	Updated to reflect addition of interview

Revisions
February 24, 2016

Section	Text	Comment
V.B. Proposal Scoring	<p>Scoring of Cost Proposal Cost Proposal (100 points) The Cost Proposal should include a completed Cost Form (Attachment 12). The Cost Form must identify the costs required to complete the deliverables as outlined in the SOW.</p> <p><u>Scoring Criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The hourly rates and total hours are reasonable and appropriate to complete each task outlined in the submitted Workplan. (Pass/Fail) ii. The total costs are consistent with the Workplan. (Pass/Fail) iii. The total cost allocations are appropriately and adequately justified. (Pass/Fail) iv. Cost review (100 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Proposer with the lowest cost shall be awarded 100 points ▪ For all other Proposers, the total cost of the lowest Proposer shall be divided by the total cost of that Proposer and multiplied by 100 points. For example, if the total cost of the lowest cost Proposer is \$900,000 and the cost of another Proposer is \$1,000,000, the result would be: $900,000/1,000,000 * 100 = 90$ points ▪ Proposers that include a certified small business will receive additional bonus points, as outlined in Section V.C. Preference Points. 	Updated to reflect addition of interview