



**Date of Issuance:** 4/02/2021

**Solicitation No.** 1600000059 Rebid

**Requisition No.** 1600004819

**Amendment No.** 1

Hour and date specified for receipt of offers is changed:  No  Yes, to: \_\_\_\_\_ CST

Pursuant to OAC 260:115-7-30(d), this document shall serve as official notice of amendment to the solicitation identified above. Such notice is being provided to all suppliers to which the original solicitation was sent.

Suppliers submitting bids or quotations shall acknowledge receipt of this solicitation amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation as follows:

Sign and return a copy of this amendment with the solicitation response being submitted; or,

If the supplier has already submitted a response, this acknowledgement must be signed and returned prior to the solicitation deadline. All amendment acknowledgements submitted separately shall have the solicitation number and bid opening date in the subject line of the email.

**ISSUED FROM:**

Jacob Charries  
Contracting Officer

(405) 521-2191  
Phone Number

[Jacob.Charries@omes.ok.gov](mailto:Jacob.Charries@omes.ok.gov)  
E-Mail Address

**RETURN TO:** [OMESCPeBID@omes.ok.gov](mailto:OMESCPeBID@omes.ok.gov)

**Description of Amendment:**

a. This is to incorporate the following:

Below are answers to questions received from Bidders. No further questions shall be accepted.

The closing date for this solicitation is not changed and remains 04/21/2021

1. Can you please advise why the subject solicitation was cancelled?  
**The agency didn't feel they quite conveyed their needs and objectives. Attachment A is slightly modified from the previous version. Minor changes but better explained.**
2. Is the goal of the solicitation is to uncover potential fraud?  
**The goal is to identify if there are any duplicative assistance for the same activity. There may not be any, but we must identify any if there is so those funds can be paid back.**
3. Is this solicitation a technology request, a services request or a fraud prevention solutions request?  
**This is a service request for a company to perform DOB analyses on UGLG beneficiaries.**
4. Are contractors permitted to bid on, and potentially be awarded contracts under, both Solicitation 1600000059-Rebid (CDBG-CV Duplication of Benefits Analysis) and Solicitation 1600000060 (CDBG-DR Duplication of Benefits Analysis)?  
**Yes, contractors may bid on the solicitations.**

5. Is the scope of Solicitation 1600000059-Rebid limited to Duplication of Benefits analysis, or is ODOC requesting broader monitoring services for subrecipients?

**The scope is limited to DOB analysis, not monitoring services for sub-recipients.**

6. Why is Solicitation 1600000059-Rebid being re-bid?

**The agency didn't feel they quite conveyed their needs and objectives. Attachment A is slightly modified from the previous version. Minor changes but better explained.**

7. Section 8.1 (E)(i) of the Bidder Instructions indicates that bidder is to provide a single total for each year of contract. Attachment A states that the initial term of the contract is one year and there are four one-year options to renew. Can OMES confirm that pricing should be provided for five years?

**Bidder should propose a single total for each year of the contract which would include 1 initial year, and up to five (5) additional renewal years.**

8. Section 8.1 (F)(1) of the Bidder Instructions discusses the Bidder Expert Lead Form. However, this form does not appear to be mentioned in section 8.2 Bid Packet Format. Where should this form be incorporated in the submittal?

**This may be included in section 8.2.H (Section Eight: Response to Specifications and Requirements) documents.**

9. Section 8.1 (G)(i), (ii), (iii) of the Bidder Instructions discusses the Level of Expertise, Risk Assessment Plan, and Value-Added Plan Exhibits. However, these exhibits do not appear to be explicitly mentioned in section 8.2 Bid Packet Format. Where should these exhibits be incorporated in the submittal?

**These may be included in section 8.2.H (Section Eight: Response to Specifications and Requirements) documents.**

10. Section 8.2 (H) of the Bidder Instructions indicates that the following information should be provided if required. Can OMES confirm the following information is required for this solicitation?

ii. The URL link to the bidder's VPAT

iii. The completed information technology Security Certification and Accreditation Assessment

iv. Proposed service level agreements

v. Proposed draft statement of work (note that Section 8.1 (G)(vi) states that the final award is dependent upon the Bidder's Scope of Work being acceptable to the Owner).

**This information should be provided in your bid response.**

11. Section 8.2 (K) of the Bidder Instructions indicates that any required financial and associated information shall be inserted in this section. What, if any, information is required to be submitted in section eleven for this solicitation?

**No information is needed for this section at this time.**

12. Section 8.2 (L) of the Bidder Instructions indicates that any required business references and associated information shall be inserted in this section. How many references are required to be submitted, and what information is required to be submitted for each reference?

**No information is needed for this section at this time.**

13. Beyond the added activities specified in Attachment A, can you provide a specific inventory of what changed between the initial bid and the re-bid of this proposal?

**The changes between the initial bid and re-bid was primarily the framing of the services requested. ODOC is looking for an outside agency to analyze duplication of benefits for subgrantees and identify any potential DOB, as well as maintain and update subgrantee data throughout the lifespan of the grant and identify any DOB that has occurred throughout the grant period.**

14. Have any of the \$8 million in CDBG-CV funds available for 2020 been distributed? If so, what awards have been made and what is the average size of each award?

For the first round of funds (\$8 million), 12 contracts have been awarded ranging from roughly \$300,000 - \$1,000,000.

15. If available or possible to whom have awards been made for 2020?

First round has been awarded to 12 units of general local government across the State.

16. The Oklahoma CDBG-CV draft plan lists 18 eligible UGLGs for 2020, as well as 9 Entitlement Communities and 11 UGLGs, participating in the Urban County Designation for Tulsa County, for 2021. Does this make up the list of possible UGLGs to be reviewed? Is there a hierarchy of review to the order in which they will be chosen?

Rounds one and two are predesignated: Round 1 Small Cities (more information can be found on ODOC's website in the 2020 CDBG-CV Draft Action Plan, there were 12 awards), Round 2 Entitlement Communities (more information can be found on ODOC's website in the 2020 CDBG-CV2 Draft Action Plan, awards have not been given but there are 10 eligible entities), and Round 3 will be open for the entire state (number of applicants and awards is unknown at this time).

17. The proposal requests pricing to perform the Duplication of Benefits review for this year. However, there is no indication of how many individual awards will be evaluated in this analysis or the exact number of UGLGs will be included. The work required to meet the expectations of this proposal might include 25 UGLGs with only one individual award review or up to 45 UGLGs, each with hundreds of individual award reviews, potentially requiring a very large variance in effort. Therefore, it is very difficult to provide an adequate pricing response when the volume or units of review are not defined. We recognize that awards may not yet be determined. In order to account for this lack of clarity around future volumes can you clarify an approach to proposing on this RFP that can be evaluated across all potential vendors? For example, can you clarify whether the proposal price should be based on each (a) UGLG that will be reviewed or (b) each CDBG-CV award reviewed, or (c) some other approach that clarifies pricing at the unit level?

An agency could base price on the number of UGLG's or beneficiaries involved as in \$XX per individual applicant file per UGLG or \$XX per UGLG. An agency could also propose another method they deem fits better. If all entities and individuals are not firmly established when awarding the contract, an estimate may be used **based on all available data** and the second year contract can then be revised to reflect changes in the volume of applicants/UGLGs/other entities requiring services based on current data at that time.

18. Section four of the CDBG-CV draft plan lists requirements of the grantee. It also outlines certain evaluation steps that will be performed by the ODOC.

a. Have any of the plan requirements from this draft plan changed since this draft plan?

b. **No, they have not.**

c. Does the ODOC plan to perform or has the ODOC already performed and documented any of the procedures that this plan states the ODOC will perform as part of the DOB plan including, but not limited to:

- a. DOC staff will review this information and coordinate with other internal programs such as Community Services Block Grant and Emergency Solutions Grant to determine if any funds represent DOB for each activity;

**No, ODOC has not at this time.**

- b. ODOC may also utilize Community Action Agencies to determine duplicative assistance.

**Many UGLG are partnering with CAAs to gather applicant information for the DOB analysis.**

19. Grantees must calculate the amount of assistance needed and the amount of funds to be received for a CDBG-CV activity. Will the ODOC be in possession of these calculations for each CDBG-CV award provided? Will the contractor be provided this analysis and any other documentation supporting the CDBG-CV award from the ODOC?

**Yes, the contractor will be in possession of all necessary documentation for them to perform an adequate analysis.**

20. Is the Bidder to research and find duplication of benefits, or are we checking compliance against the requirement that grantees are to monitor themselves?

**Yes, the bidder is to research and find DOB.**

21. Referencing Attachment A, item 2.A.i, what would the initial analysis of applicants and subrecipients entail? There are many possibilities; for example, the bidder could review only the total grant amounts distributed to the UGLGs, or the bidder may be required to look not only at the UGLGs distributed award, but also look at the individual citizens and businesses obtaining funding through the UGLGs award.

**The initial analysis would include looking at the UGLGs, as well as the individuals/citizens that receive awards.**

22. Referencing Attachment A, item 2.A.i, are the “possible DOB updates” referring to the UGLG’s own compliance with DOB monitoring, or are they updates the bidder must research and find regarding DOBs found?

**The bidder would research and find new information, as well as receive updated information from the UGLG.**

23. Did the original budgeted amount of \$175,000 change for this rebid, if so, what is the budget for this solicitation?

**ODOC is looking for proposed budgets from the agencies that are applying.**

24. Is the budget for this solicitation assuming all 45, 25, or some other amount of UGLGs will be included in the year 1 review scope?

**In the first review scope, 12 UGLGs from CV1 will be included and up to 10 UGLGs from CV2. Round 3 numbers are not established at this time and will likely not be until later this year. Those entities will also need to be included in the year 1 review scope.**

25. Is there an estimated total 5-year budget for this project?

**Not at this time.**

26. Is the scope of services just pertaining to each UGLG’s own CDBG-CV application and award, or is it referring to all sub-applicants and beneficiaries of each UGLG (ie, each citizen receiving food and rental assistance)? If the latter, is the bidder expected to review 100% of sub-applicants/beneficiaries or would a sampling approach be assumed?

**The services pertain to all applicants of UGLGs for CDBG-CV funds. All citizens need to be reviewed, not just a sample.**

27. The act of ensuring compliance implies current practices are already in place by the UGLG; of the services being requested, to what extent, if any, apply to the creation, initiation, and execution of compliance measures, as opposed to simply verifying whether current measures in place, reasonable, and compliant?

**The consultant can review all information that is received by the UGLG and perform a DOB analysis but if more information is necessary to perform the analysis the consultant may request such information. Further, if the consultant believes that additional forms or documentation must be required of all applicants, this too may be implemented to ensure correct DOB analyses.**

**28. In working with the UGLGs, are the services expected to be completed remotely/virtually or physically at the UGLG's location?**

Services can likely all be done remotely but the consultant has the opportunity to perform in person meetings with the UGLGs or ODOC if deemed necessary.

**29. What is the scope and frequency of quality reviews or audits that will be performed by the State of Oklahoma to verify the completeness and accuracy of the services provided by the winning bidder?**

ODOC will likely review updates provided by the consultant, as well as 2 separate reviews to verify completeness throughout the lifespan of the grant.

**30. What kind of turnaround time can we expect from State of Oklahoma personnel regarding verbal day to day questions and questions for management?**

The consultant can expect a turnaround time of 1 business day for questions.

**31. What kind of turnaround time can we expect from the State of Oklahoma regarding written report responses?**

The consultant can expect a turnaround time of 5 business days.

**32. Regarding Section 8. H., is the information technology VPAT, Security Certification and Accreditation Assessment, service level agreements, and statement of work, all required?**

This information should be provided in your bid response.

b. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Representative Name (**PRINT**) Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Representative Signature