

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR
EMPLOYMENT SERVICES FOR THE WELFARE TO WORK PROGRAM, THE FOOD
SUPPLEMENTAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM, AND THE NON-
CUSTODIAL PARENT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
FOR FREDERICK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
FCDSS/FIA/12-005-S

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES #3
POST PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE**

Question 1: The workshop room had about 20 seats, there are perhaps six computers for job search, and there is existing office capacity for three people (although the room likely could fit five). Do you believe there is sufficient work space available to accommodate 59 referrals *every week*, as the RFP suggests?

Response: Yes, the space is large enough to accommodate large groups. The referrals are split between the curriculum component that is offered in the morning and the direct job search that is conducted in the afternoon. On the opposite side of the work space itself are additional computers that can be used by the customers at certain times if needed.

Question 2: Will you please share the number of incumbent staff the current vendor uses to deliver the same, or largely the same, services as are outlined in the RFP?

Response: The current contractor currently maintains two staff persons on-site as required by Section 3.3.2 B (2).

Question 3: I am able to bill for my hours on-site. Will I be able to do the same for the two program staff personnel that will be housed there? Or will it ALL be based upon the 40/35/25 performance metrics?

Response: The entire remittance is based on performance. There is no base funding.

Question 4: Will you please share the existing achievement of the incumbent contractor for the categories of customer, as delineated on Attachment A? It appears that the incumbent clearly has an unfair advantage with respect to devising a FLFUP by possessing this information when no other proposer does. Specifically, what

percentage of customers for each category are reaching the designated payout points at this time?

Response: In 2011, the payout points for each category are as follows:

TCA

- Level 1 - Guaranteed Payment - 100% met**
- Level 2 - 90% Base month completed 40 hr. workshop or became employed - 100% met**
- Level 3 - 75% Base month employed 6 weeks - 100% met**
- Level 4 - 60% Base month employed 17 weeks - 97% met**

Foodstamp

- Level 1 - Guaranteed Payment - 100% met**
- Level 2 - 90% Base month completed 24-hr. workshop - 100% met**

NPEP

- Level 1 Guaranteed Payment - 100% met**
- Level 2 - 80% Base month completed 40-hr. workshop - 100% met**
- Level 3 - 20% Base month employed 2 consecutive weeks - 80% met**

Please note: The payout points in this RFP are different from those under the current contract. Offerors should base their FLFUP on the payout points in this RFP and not on past performance.

Question 5: Attachment A asks us to estimate/guess at the number of customers who will reach the payout points, then establishes not-to-exceed payout amounts available for each category based on the guess/estimate. As a result, if we achieve at a rate greater than our estimate, we apparently cannot earn the associated dollars. For example, the WPR goal is 70% - if we use 70% as our guess, that sets a ceiling on potential payouts specifically at that rate of performance. Does the State intend to pay for actual performance achieved or performance guessed at during the procurement process?

Response: Actual performance, based on the submission of invoice data to verify the completion of specific payout points for each customer.