



Request For Proposals for

Homeless Street Outreach and Engagement, Housing Navigation, and Case Management

RFP OHS 20-06

ADDENDUM NO. 02 to RFP DBH 20-06

The following revisions have been made to Homeless Street Outreach and Engagement, Housing Navigation, and Case Management Request for Proposals:

I. Article VII. Evaluation, has been revised to read as follows:

Proposals will be subject to an Initial Review to confirm responsiveness, by determining whether each Proposal includes the stipulated content, required certifications or licensing, etc., and is presented in the required format, in order for the Proposal to advance for evaluation. Any reasonable person reviewing for responsiveness must be able to ascertain that the Proposal meets these requirements.

The evaluation process includes the following categories, and may include additional specific criteria. Likewise, the listed considerations are possible considerations, and may not be the only factors involved in the evaluation.

All projects will be reviewed and scored based on the following:

- The extent to which the proposed project includes the stipulated content.
- The extent to which the proposed project is oriented with promising homeless outreach practices.
- The extent to which the proposed project includes any certifications, licenses, and/or permits.
- The extent to which the proposed project cost is reasonable or appropriate to complete the project.
- The extent to which the proposed project supplements the current programs.

Evaluation

A. Housing First Emphasis (15 points)

- The extent to which proposer conforms to California's Housing First policy.
- Housing Emphasis-The extent to which proposer practices Housing First policies. Housing First practices include rapid placement and stabilization for housing permanency and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions.

- The extent to which the proposal can provide flexible services that facilitates housing access and housing stability as quickly as possible for individuals experiencing homelessness.
- The extent to which housing is offered without preconditions and barriers to entry, such as sobriety, treatment, or service participation requirements.
- The extent to which the supportive services proposed maximize housing opportunities and stability and prevent returns to homelessness as opposed to addressing predetermined treatment goals prior to permanent housing entry.
- The extent to which the proposal describes an approach that people need basic necessities like food and a place to live before attending to anything less critical, such as getting a job, budgeting properly, or attending to mental health or substance use issues.
- The extent to which the proposal demonstrates that tenant choice is valuable in housing selection as well as supportive service participation, and that exercising that choice is likely to make an individual more successful in remaining housed and improving their life.

B. Qualifications and Experience (30 points)

- The proposer's experience and capacity in providing **Outreach and Engagement**, the length and type of experience it has working with the homeless, outcomes of the programs/services it provides, experience with similar services, experience working with local homeless services agencies, and the experience level of key staff.
- The proposer's experience and capacity in providing **Housing Navigation**, the length and type of experience it has working with the homeless, outcomes of the of programs/services it provides, experience with similar services, experience working with local homeless services agencies, and the experience level of key staff.
- The proposer's experience and capacity in providing **Case Management**, the length and type of experience it has working with the homeless, outcomes of the of programs/services it provides, experience with similar services, experience working with local homeless services agencies, and the experience level of key staff.
- Experience working in the Central Valley: Colton, Fontana, Rialto, San Bernardino, Bloomington, Muscoy and Highland.

C. Technical Review (25 points)

- The extent to which the proposed project addresses the eligible services as described in the RFP.
- The extent to which the proposed project addresses the focus on those experiencing chronic homelessness.
- The extent to which the proposed project addresses strategies and interventions in engaging and assisting homeless individuals.
- The extent to which the proposed project addresses how it will ramp up staffing and services.
- The extent to which measurable outcomes will be tracked and reported.

D. Cost Review (20 points)

- The proposer's proposed staffing budget costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project.
- The proposer's proposed housing costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project.

E. References (10 points)

- The applicant's ability to demonstrate satisfactory performance of similar work, work product, and demonstrated knowledge and expertise.

The County may, at its sole discretion, create a shortlist of Proposals for further evaluation; require an oral interview, presentation, or demonstration; and utilize outside experts to assist in the evaluation process; and/or issue a request for Best and Final Offer (BAFO) from one or more Proposers.

The County will establish an evaluation panel with responsibility for reviewing all Proposals and conducting the evaluation. A Facilitator will manage the integrity of the evaluation process and will not be a voting member of the evaluation panel. An initial meeting will be scheduled and held with the evaluation panel

members, wherein the Facilitator will distribute all relevant documents to the evaluators including the RFP, evaluation worksheets for each Proposal, and written evaluation instructions.

After the initial meeting, evaluators will independently review and score the Proposals. The evaluation panel will then convene again to discuss the individual scores to resolve questions and to discuss the basis for individual scores, but not for the evaluators to agree upon scoring. At the end of this discussion, each evaluator will be given an option to revise his/her scores.

Evaluators will make independent determinations for scores, including review and understanding of any additional information obtained by the group discussion. In the event a score is revised, the evaluator will strike out the original score, document the new score, and provide comments to support the revision.

If clarifying information is needed at any point, the Facilitator will contact Proposer(s) to obtain the necessary information. The Facilitator will then provide the information to the evaluation panel electronically or verbally, as appropriate.

If the evaluation process includes components such as oral interviews, product demonstration, and/or site visits, the Facilitator will coordinate those with evaluators. Individual scoring and any subsequent evaluation panel meetings with respect to such components must be conducted.

Once all ratings are finalized and documented, the Facilitator will collect individual evaluation worksheets to create a final evaluation scoring worksheet.