



JONATHAN E. FIELDING, M.D., M.P.H.

Director and Health Officer

CYNTHIA A. HARDING, M.P.H.

Chief Deputy Director

313 North Figueroa Street, Room 806
Los Angeles, California 90012
TEL (213) 240-8117 • FAX (213) 975-1273

www.publichealth.lacounty.gov

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Gloria Molina

First District

Mark Ridley-Thomas

Second District

Zev Yaroslavsky

Third District

Don Knabe

Fourth District

Michael D. Antonovich

Fifth District

September 26, 2013

ADDENDUM NUMBER 1

**TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY HEALTH SURVEY
(RFP 2013-007)**

On August 21, 2013, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health (DPH) released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals from qualified organizations to conduct the Los Angeles County Health Survey (LACHS) to residents of Los Angeles County. The LACHS is a population-based survey that serves as the County's primary vehicle for gathering information about access to health care, health care utilizations, health behaviors, health status, and perceptions about health-related issues.

As indicated in the RFP, Section 1.5, County Rights & Responsibilities, the County has the right to amend the RFP by written addendum. This Addendum Number 1 amends the RFP as indicated below (new or revised language is **highlighted** for easy reference):

1. RFP, Section 3.4, Stage 2: Proposal Evaluation Review (900 Points), the first paragraph, is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced by the following:

"Proposals that pass Stage 1 will be evaluated in the Stage 2 Proposal Evaluation Review, which will consist of the evaluation sections listed below. Each evaluation section has a total point value, for a combined total of **900** points for the Stage 2 Proposal Evaluation Review."
2. RFP, Appendix A: Sample Contract, Paragraph 5, Invoices and Payment, Subparagraph D, is hereby deleted in its entirety.

As indicated in the RFP, Section 2.5, Proposers' Questions, questions that were received by the September 6, 2013 deadline and corresponding answers are being issued as part of this Addendum as follows:

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

- Q1:** **Page 31, Section 2.9.5, Subsection A, Paragraph 3 asks that proposers "include Curriculum Vitae, or a brief biographical sketch of key project personnel." Is it acceptable to refer reviewers to an appendix containing Curriculum Vitae's (CVs) of key project personnel, or is it preferred that CVs be included within the body of Section C.1 of the proposal?**
- A1:** CVs should be included in Section C.1 of the proposal as indicated in the RFP, Section 2.9.5, Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services, Subsection A, Paragraph 3, "Please include Curriculum Vitae, or a brief biographical sketch of key project personnel, which demonstrate staff's ability to provide the required services."

Q2: **Page 28, Section 2.9.4, Subsection B describes requirements for the inclusion of proposer references but it does not specify whether or not a proposer may include a reference from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. May a proposer solicit and/or include a reference from an employee of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health?**

A2: Yes, Proposers may use DPH as a reference.

PROPOSER'S APPROACH TO PROVIDE REQUIRED SERVICES

Q3: **Page 32, Section 2.9.5, Subsection B, Paragraph 1c specifies that the proposer should describe “proposed methods for oversampling smaller geographic areas of LAC,” while also specifying that the design must achieve “a minimum of 500 completed interviews per Adult Survey and Child Survey in each LAC SPA.” Should proposers simply describe how they would oversample smaller areas, but not include these techniques in the design or budget?**

A3: No, proposers shall describe the proposed methods to address each of the requirements stated in Section 2.9.5, Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services, Subsection B, Paragraph 1c. Proposer's budget should be comprised of a completed Appendix C (Proposer's Budget) and should include all costs, etc. needed to provide all the services outlined in Appendix B (Statement of Work) and in Appendix B-1 Proposer's Scope of Work).

Q4: **How many staff hours does Los Angeles County Department of Public Health estimate the core project will require?**

A4: Proposers response to 2.9.5, Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services, will determine the number of hours proposer will need to complete the project.

Q5: **Section 1.1.1., Background, Paragraph 1, P. 1 states, “The LACHS allows DPH to obtain health indicator data for large demographic subgroups across geographic regions of LAC, including LAC Service Planning Areas (SPA) and Health Districts.” Attachment 1 is the map of the 2012 SPA and Health Districts.**

- a. Is there a source that you can refer us to for a precise definition of the SPA and Health Districts (for example in terms of ZIP codes or Census defined areas)?**
- b. The map notes that Long Beach and Pasadena are “their own health districts.” Are residents of Long Beach and Pasadena to be included in the survey? If they are to be included, please confirm that a minimum number of Adult Survey interviews are not required for these cities.**

A5:

- a. As referenced in Appendix B, Attachment 1, the map is based on 2010 Census TIGER/Line Shapefiles from U.S. Census Bureau, Geography Division. A GIS map viewer of Los Angeles County is available at: <http://gis.lacounty.gov/dph>.**
- b. Residents of Long Beach and Pasadena are to be included in the LACHS as part of SPA 3 and SPA 8, respectively.**

- Q6:** **Appendix B, Section 10.0 Specific Work Requirements subsection 10.4 and 10.5.** The survey requires a minimum percentage of completed interviews be obtained from cell-only users, and at the same time, a minimum of 500 households from each SPA. Does the percentage of cell-only interviews apply to the SPA minimums? That is, is the requirement to obtain 100 cell-only interviews in each SPA?
- A6:** No, as indicated in the RFP, Appendix B, Statement of Work, Section 10.0, Specific Work Requirements, Subsection 10.7, the Contractor shall be responsible for implementing “a cell phone sample to improve sampling coverage due to the increased prevalence of LAC households that do not have a landline telephone. A minimum of twenty percent (20%) completing the Adult Survey should be cell phone-only users and at least ten percent (10%) completing the Child Survey should be cell phone-only users.”
- Q7:** [2011 and 2009 Methodology Reports – Page 7 in 2011] A complete file of directory-listed residential numbers from Donnelley Marketing Information Services (DMIS) was used by SSI to remove 100-banks from the frame if they contained zero residential listings. The resulting frame contains all 100-banks from exchanges that serve LA County with at least 1 residential listed telephone number. This is known as a list-assisted landline frame. Would it be acceptable to utilize an RDD sampling methodology for land lines that includes “zero banks?”
- A7:** The source of the above question is not referenced in the RFP. Please refer to the RFP, Section 2.9.5, Proposer’s Approach to Providing Required Services.
- Q8:** **Page 4, Section 1.1.2, Description of Required Services, Subsection G,** “Implement a cell phone sample to improve sampling coverage due to the increased prevalence of LAC households that do not have a landline telephone. A minimum of twenty percent (20%) completing the Adult Survey should be cell phone-only users and at least ten percent (10%) completing the Child Survey should be cell phone-only users.” The requirement for a specific number of interviews from cell-only users implies that the cellular telephone interview should screen for cell-only users, thus employing non-overlapping frames. Is the County amenable to an overlapping dual frame design if it reduces bias and increases efficiency, assuming the results are properly weighted to account for the overlap?
- A8:** As stated in the RFP, Section 2.9.5, Proposer’s Approach to Providing Required Services, Subsection B, Paragraph 1e., proposers must describe proposed sampling methods to identify cell phone-only users who reside in LAC, in order to include a sample of cell phone users (in the total Adult Survey count of approximately 8,000 – 9,000). A Minimum of twenty percent (20%) completing the Adult Survey should be cell phone-only users and at least ten percent (10%) completing the Child Survey should be cell phone-only users. Proposers shall describe methods (including incentives) that would be used to contact, engage, and reimburse cell phone-only users.

REQUIRED FORMS

- Q9:** **Appendix D, Exhibits 1-24. Are subcontractors required to submit all forms included in Appendix D?**

- A9: No, subcontractors are not required to submit the forms included in Appendix D. However, as indicated in the RFP, Section 2.9.5, Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services, Subsection A, Paragraph 4, proposers shall provide relevant background information and describe the experience of any subcontractors involved in the proposal.
- Q10: Exhibit 3, List of all public entities for which the Contractor has provided service within the last five (5) years, our organization has contracted with hundreds of public entities over the past five years. To limit the list, would the County accept a list of only those entities and contracts that most closely resemble the services being proposed?**
- A10: No, as indicated in the RFP, Section 2.9.4, Proposer's Qualifications, Subsection B, Paragraph b, Prospective Contractor List of Contracts, Appendix D (Required Forms), Exhibit 3, the listing must include all Public Entities contracts for the last five (5) years.

PROPOSER' BUDGET

- Q11: The Budget Instructions on page 9 of Appendix C, Paragraph 4, state the following:** “Indirect costs cannot exceed 10% of total direct costs. Identify the method for calculating indirect costs. Indirect cost or administrative overhead are costs that are incurred for a common joint purpose benefiting more than one cost objective, and not readily attributable to any particular program or service. These costs may include salaries, wages, and fringe benefits of administrative personnel whose effort benefits more than one cost objective; operational and maintenance costs that benefit more than one cost objective; and/or expenses such as rent for percentage of space occupied by administrative personnel, etc.” Would it be acceptable for potential bidders to bid indirect cost rates consistent with their indirect cost rates negotiated with the federal government?
- A11: No, as indicated in the RFP, Appendix C, Proposer's Budget, Indirect Costs, total Indirect Costs cannot exceed 10% of total direct costs.
- Q12: Page 10, Section 1.14, Notice to proposer Regarding The Public Records Act, subsection 1.14.1, “Responses to this solicitation shall become the exclusive property of the County. Absent extraordinary circumstances, the recommended proposer's proposal will become a matter of public record when (1) contract negotiations are complete; (2) DPH receives a letter from the recommended Proposer's authorized officer that the negotiated contract is the firm offer of the recommended Proposer; and (3) DPH releases a copy of the recommended Proposer's proposal in response to a Notice of Intent to Request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review under Board Policy No. 5.055. Notwithstanding the above, absent extraordinary circumstances, all proposals will become a matter of public record when the Department's proposer recommendation appears on the Board agenda. Exceptions to disclosure are those parts or portions of all proposals that are justifiably defined as business or trade secrets, and plainly marked by the Proposer as "Trade Secret," "Confidential," or "Proprietary."**

We would like to know if the cost detail, specifically Appendix C – Proposer's Budget (Standard Format), can be a specified as a “Proprietary” portion of the proposal and exempt from public disclosure.

- A12: Yes, however, as indicated in the RFP, Section 1.14, Notice to Proposer's Regarding the Public Records Act, the County shall not, in any way, be liable or responsible for the disclosure of any such record or any parts thereof, if disclosure is required or permitted under the California Public Records Act or otherwise by law. A blanket statement of confidentiality or the marking of each page of the proposal as confidential shall not be deemed sufficient notice of exception. The Proposers must specifically label only those provisions of their respective proposal which are "Trade Secrets," "Confidential," or "Proprietary" in nature.
- Q13: The proposal format provided in Appendix C does not include a section for profit or fee. Can the contractor modify Proposer's Budget (Standard Format) table to include profit?**
- A13: No, proposers shall complete their budget as outlined in the RFP, Section 2.9.6, Proposers Budget and in Appendix C, Proposer's Budget.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION REVIEW

- Q14: Section 3.4, Stage 2: Proposal Evaluation Review, pp. 41-44. The header for this section, "Stage 2: Proposal Evaluation Review (900 Points)" specifies that 900 points will be allocated during the proposal evaluation process, however the paragraph that follows states that "Each evaluation section has a total point value, for a combined total of 950 points for the Stage 2 Proposal Evaluation Review." The point allocation is further specified as follows:**
- a. 3.4.1 Proposer's Qualifications Section (50 Points)
 - b. 3.4.3 Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services Section (675 Points)
 - c. 3.4.4 Proposer's Scope of Work Section (50 Points)
 - d. 3.4.5 Proposer's Budget Section (65 Points)
 - e. 3.4.6 Proposer's Quality Control Plan Section (50 Points)
 - f. 3.4.7 Proposer's Green Initiatives Section (10 Points)

Can you please confirm that there is a total of 900 points available for stage 2 proposal evaluation of which 65 points are awarded based on cost?

- A14: The total point value for Stage 2, Proposal Evaluation and Review is 900. Please refer to item number 1 of this addendum (Page 1).

SAMPLE CONTRACT, APPENDIX A

- Q15: Sample contract, Appendix A, Article 5, Invoices and Payment, paragraph D (p. 8 of sample contract) states, "If the actual allowable and documented costs are less than the fee-for-service rate(s) set in the schedule(s), Contractor shall be reimbursed for the actual costs." Are the "actual allowable and documented costs" referenced in the paragraph inclusive of the Contractor's fee or profit?**

- A15: Please refer to item number 2 of this Addendum (Page 1).

BACKGROUND AND SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

- Q16: Page 11, Section 1.18, Background and Security Investigation and on Page -1 of the Additional Provisions, Paragraph 1, Administration of Contract, subparagraph G, background and Security Investigation, indicates that staff under the contract**

who are in a “designated sensitive position, as determined by the County,” need to undergo background investigation through fingerprints submitted to the California Department of Justice. Can LACDPH provide guidance on which staff will be considered to be in sensitive positions and requiring this level of background investigation?

- A16: Currently, DPH defines a sensitive position as any individual performing duties posing a potential threat or risk to the County or to the public when performed by persons who have criminal history incompatible with those duties, whether those persons are employees of the County or perform those services pursuant to contract.

Addendum Number 1 has been posted on the following County of Los Angeles website at:
<http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/cg/Index.htm>

Thank you for your interest in contracting with the County of Los Angeles. Except for the revisions contained in Addendum Number 1, there are no other revisions to the RFP.

LD
02522