JONATHAN E. FIELDING, M.D., M.P.H. Director and Health Officer

JONATHAN E. FREEDMAN 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

August 6, 2012

ADDENDUM NUMBER 2 TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR HEALTY EATING ACTIVE LIVING INITIATIVES

On July 9, 2012, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health (DPH) released a RFP to solicit proposals from qualified cities, non-profit organizations, colleges, universities, and/or school districts in Los Angeles County to develop and implement one or more strategies that will create an environment where it is convenient, safe, and easy for community members to eat healthy and participate in physical activity every day.

As indicated in the RFP, Paragraph 2.5, Proposers' Questions, questions and corresponding answers received by the July 23, 2012 deadline are being issued as part of this Addendum, (Attachment 1). Attachment 2 is a list of the Proposers who submitted the Mandatory Intent to Apply (MIA) Form by the RFP deadline.

Additionally, as indicated in the RFP, Paragraph 1.10, County Rights & Responsibilities, the County may amend the RFP by written addendum. This Addendum Number 2 amends the RFP as indicated below:

1. RFP, Paragraph 1.1, Purpose, second paragraph shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows (Note: revisions are identified in **bold font**):

"Interested and qualified Proposers may submit **one or more** Proposals. **Each proposal must pursue** one or more strategies listed in the Menu of Evidence-Based Strategies in Sub-paragraph 1.7.1. At a minimum, one strategy must be fully developed within the first two years, and implementation initiated within the first several months of Year 3."

2. RFP, Paragraph 1.6, Initiative Goals and Objectives, bullet number 11 shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows (Note: revisions are identified in **bold font**):

"Proposed strategy **should** be led by an organization and a partnership with a history of leading successful healthy eating and active living strategies; and"

3. RFP, Paragraph 1.7.1, Strategy Selection, first paragraph shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows (Note: revisions are identified in **bold font**):

"Proposer may submit a proposal on one or more of the strategies listed on the Menu of Evidence-Based Strategies below. Strategies can be selected from one or any combination of the Active Living, Healthy Eating, and School District categories. The proposed strategy(ies) must be developed and implemented in one jurisdiction unless pursuing a regional initiative as described in Sub-paragraph 1.7.4."



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



- 4. RFP, Paragraph 1.7.2.A, Partner Selection, second paragraph labeled *Note shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows (Note: revisions are identified in **bold font**):
 - "Note: **1)** School Districts may be exempt from the partnership requirement if they can justify their decision in the RFP narrative that the proposed initiative does not require city and/or non-profit organization participation.
 - 2) If partnering with a County department, the selected County department must have the authority to approve and implement the proposed strategy(ies). Proposer may not partner with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health."
- 5. RFP, Paragraph 1.7.2.B, Partnership Requirements, under the heading <u>If a Proposer is a</u> <u>non-profit organization, college or university</u>, second paragraph shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows (Note: revisions are identified in **bold font**):

"Required city/school district partner must, within 60 days of contract execution, secure a city council resolution (or school district equivalent) committing staff to work on specified SOW activities. (Note: If the Proposer has more than one required partner, the Proposer will need a resolution from <u>each</u> partner.)"

- 6. RFP, Paragraph 1.14, Contact with County Personnel, shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows (Note: revisions are identified in **bold font**):
 - "1.14, Contact with County **Department of Public Health** Personnel

All contact regarding this RFP or any matter relating thereto must be in writing and mailed or e-mailed to:

Louisa Franco 695 S. Vermont Avenue, 14th Floor (South Tower) Los Angeles, CA 90005 E-mail: Ifranco@ph.lacounty.gov

If it is discovered that Proposer or any of its partners contacted and received information from any County **DPH** personnel, other than the person specified above, regarding this solicitation, County, in its sole determination, may disqualify the proposal from further consideration. **Proposer may contact other Los Angeles County Department personnel if the County Department has the authority to approve and implement the proposed strategy.**"

Addendum Number 2 has been posted on the following County of Los Angeles website: 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 and Addendum Number 2, there are no other revisions to the RFP.

Attachments (2)

Addendum Number 2 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR HEALTHY EATING ACTIVE LIVING INITIATIVES ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS PART 1

As indicated in the RFP, Paragraph 2.5, Proposer's Questions, all Part 1 questions were due by July 23, 2012 by 3:30 p.m. Questions and corresponding answers are as follows:

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Q1. Can a Proposer submit more than one proposal?

- A1. Yes. See Addendum 2, Item Number 1. Each proposal shall be submitted in the prescribed format indicated in RFP, Paragraph 2.8, Business Proposal Format.
- Q2. Paragraph 1.7.3, it specifies that the proposer is required to hire one-person, fulltime, in a project management capacity – I just want to make sure that indeed this is the case and I have not misinterpreted the language. Is this correct?
- A2. Yes, RFP, Paragraph 1.7.3 states that the "Selected Proposers are required to hire <u>one</u> <u>person</u> to serve as a full-time Project Manager."
- Q3. Does the resolution that's due within 60 days of contract execution need to be from the city and school district OR one of them?
- A3. RFP, Paragraph 1.7.2.B, Partnership Requirements, states that the "Required city/school district <u>partner</u> must, within 60 days of contract execution, **secure a city council resolution** (or school district equivalent) committing staff to work on specified SOW activities." (Note: If the Proposer has more than one required partner, the Proposer will need a resolution from <u>each</u> partner. See Addendum 2, Item Number 5.)

REQUIRED EXPERIENCE

- Q4. Per Paragraph 1.4.3, it appears that if the City, as the Proposer, does not have the required 2 years experience working on active living or healthy eating initiatives, then the non-profit organization would have to take the lead. Paragraph 1.6 states that the proposed strategy must be lead by an organization <u>and</u> a partnership with a history of leading these types of strategies. Therefore, does this mean that as long as the City and its partnership together have the experience, then the City could take the lead and be deemed as the Proposer?
- A4. No. RFP, Paragraph 1.4.3 states that "Proposer must have a minimum of two years of experience within the last seven years working on active living or healthy eating initiatives." A required partner's experience will not be accepted in lieu of the Proposer's experience.

Addendum Number 2 Attachment 1 August 6, 2012 Page 2 of 5

- Q5. I am writing on behalf of a school district, can you clarify the expectation of "Proposer must have a minimum of two (2) years of experience within the last seven (7) years working on active living or healthy eating initiatives."
- A5. RFP, Paragraph 1.4.3, minimum requirement is defined as Proposer having a minimum of two (2) years experience within the last seven (7) years working on: 1) active living initiatives defined as opportunities to incorporate physical activity as a form of transportation or recreation, into daily routines; or 2) healthy eating initiatives defined as the opportunity to eat, grow, select, or purchase healthy foods and beverages that meet specific nutrition standards.

ELIGIBILITY

- Q6. Are initiatives occurring within the cities of Pasadena and Long Beach eligible to apply since these cities have their own health departments?
- A6. Yes. RFP, Paragraph 1.4.5 states that the proposed initiatives must take place in Los Angeles County. Pasadena and Long Beach are within Los Angeles County.
- Q7. Is the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) eligible to apply?

A7. No. RFP, Paragraph 1.4.1 states that Proposer must be one of the following:

a) City; or

- b) California, non-profit organization with 501(c)(3) status that has been in business for more than two years; or
- c) Non-profit without 501(c)(3) status that has been in business for more than two years and applying through a credible fiscal sponsor; or
- d) College or university; or
- e) School district.

Metro does not fall under the categories listed in RFP, Paragraph 1.4.1.

Q8. Are individual school sites able to apply for the HEAL grant?

- A8. No. RFP, Paragraph 1.4.1 states that Proposer must be one of the following:
 - a) City; or
 - b) California, non-profit organization with 501(c)(3) status that has been in business for more than two years; or
 - c) Non-profit without 501(c)(3) status that has been in business for more than two years and applying through a credible fiscal sponsor; or
 - d) College or university; or
 - e) School district.

Individual school sites, other than colleges or universities, do not fall under the categories listed in RFP, Paragraph 1.4.1.

- Q9. We are a non-profit organization working in collaboration with several partnerships that involve the community, business, university and government. The university plays an important role in the development of the initiative. Will it strengthen the proposal to have the non-profit as the lead agency or have the university take the lead?
- A9. All Proposals shall be reviewed and evaluated using the criteria stated in RFP, Paragraph 3.0, Selection Process and Evaluation Criteria.

Addendum Number 2 Attachment 1 August 6, 2012 Page 3 of 5

PARTNERSHIPS

- Q10. Can one non-profit organization be the lead on one application and named as a partner on others?
- A10. Yes.
- Q11. Is a school district required to have a partner?
- A11. Yes. RFP, Paragraph 1.7.2 A, Partner Selection states that a school district must partner with a city (or County department in unincorporated areas only) AND/OR non-profit organization unless they can justify in the RFP narrative that their initiative does not require city, County and/or non-profit organization participation.
- Q12. Our required partner is a school district. If awarded the HEAL grant, can we submit letter instead of a resolution committing staff to work on Scope of Work activities?
- A12. DPH will work with selected Proposers who partner with school districts to identify the most appropriate type of documentation needed to commit school district staff to the initiative.
- Q13. Paragraph 1.7.2 B specifies that the non-profit partner must receive at least \$20,000 per year from the Proposer. The assumption is that the monies from the HEAL grant can be utilized for this purpose. Is this correct?
- A13. Yes, HEAL grant funding can be used to pay the non-profit partner for their services.
- Q14. According to Paragraph 1.14 we cannot discuss our proposal with County personnel. However, if our required partner is a County Department, per Paragraph 1.7.2 we have to discuss the proposal with them. Are we allowed to speak with County personnel if they are our required partner?
- A14. Yes. Please see Addendum Number 2, Item Number 6.
- Q15. When submitting the Mandatory Intent to Apply Form, what proof do we have to provide to show our partner is on board with the initiative?
- A15. Proposers must simply state the name of the partner on the Mandatory Intent to Apply Form. DPH does not require any additional documentation.

USE OF FUNDING

- Q16. Would this be a funding source that may allow us to continue our assessments, evaluation, and promotion of joint-use agreements? Can we use the funding to run programs or perform maintenance within the terms of a current joint-use agreement?
- A16. Proposers are strongly encouraged to propose a new joint-use agreement or significantly expand an existing joint-use agreement. RFP, Paragraph 1.7.1, Strategy Selection, Menu of Evidence-Based Strategies, Number 32 states that the proposed joint-use agreement must be in effect for two years and provide the public access to at least four separate locations to be physically active (e.g. four schools). DPH will consider allowing the selected Proposer to conduct a limited amount of programmatic work during the implementation phase of the initiative.

- Q17. Strategy #30 on page 10 of the RFP states "School district policies that prioritize physical education (PE) and develop and implement an action plan to meet state PE requirements." We are interested in seeing that school pools are put to use during after school programs, which do not quality for P.E. Is this an acceptable strategy?
- A17. Yes. DPH strongly encourages Proposers to pursue healthy eating and/or active living strategies that will impact the entire school district. In this particular case, DPH encourages the Proposer to pursue a strategy (such as a community-use agreement, joint-use agreement, or school district policy) that will open all school district pools after school.
- Q18. The purpose of the RFP is to "develop and implement one or more evidencebased strategies that will create environments where it is convenient, safe, and easy for community members to eat healthier and participate in physical activity every day." However, in HEAL RFP Paragraph 1.8.2, the RFP states that grant funds may not be used to pay for physical changes to the environment. If the funding cannot be use for projects such as striping bike lanes how are we expected to implement the plans and make real changes?
- A18. The intent of this grant is to enable organizations to hire staff to thoughtfully develop and implement a healthy eating and/or active living strategy appropriate for the target community. RFP, Paragraph 1.8.2 states that although grant funds <u>may not be used to pay for physical changes to the environment</u> (e.g. way finding signage, paint, trees, construction, etc), staff time may be used to plan, and coordinate physical project(s) aligned with initiative's fully developed strategy(ies). DPH will also consider allowing the selected Proposer to conduct a limited amount of programmatic work (e.g. violence prevention program, Safe Routes to School encouragement activities) during the implementation phase as long as the program is an integral part of the initiative's success.
- Q19. Can grant monies be used to rebuild a community hiking trail?
- A19. Grant funding cannot be used to rebuild or build the actual hiking trail. However, developing a comprehensive hiking trail master plan is acceptable.

GEOGRAPHY

- Q20. Can I propose an initiative that will occur in two different jurisdictions that do not share a geographical border?
- A20. No, RFP, Paragraph 1.7.4 states that Proposers may pursue a regional initiative, where multiple jurisdictions that share a geographic border develop and implement the same strategy(ies).
- Q21. How specific do we need to be about the jurisdiction?
- A21. RFP, Paragraph 1.3, Terms and Definitions, defines jurisdiction as the city, community plan area, school district, or unincorporated area where the proposed initiative will occur. Proposers should be as specific as possible when describing their jurisdiction.

Addendum Number 2 Attachment 1 August 6, 2012 Page 5 of 5

Q22. We would like access to public health data (specifically obesity rate and physical activity level) in GIS format to allow us to geographically refine our proposed project area. Will this data be made available to proposers for analysis?

A22. We do not have public health data available in GIS format for potential Proposers. Health district data is available in Appendix P of the HEAL RFP. There are also several reputable data sources that may or may not include city level data including, but not limited to: http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/ha/

http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/ha/hasurveyintro.htm http://www.chis.ucla.edu/

<u>OTHER</u>

- Q23. Will there be Bidders' or Proposers' conference?
- A23. No.
- Q24. Is the Request for Solicitation Requirement mandatory?
- A24. No.
- Q25. Is the HEAL grant different from the Community Transformation Grant Small Communities Program? If our organization is currently applying for the CTG Small Communities Program, does this affect eligibility for the HEAL grant.
- A25. Yes, the HEAL grant is different than the Community Transformation Grant Small Communities Program. No, applying for the CTG Small Communities Program <u>does not</u> affect you eligibility to submit an application in response to the HEAL RFP.
- Q26. Is this solicitation competitive for city-based health departments that have done tremendous efforts in the area of nutrition? Or is there a preference to work with local cities that may have not done as much in the nutrition area as other jurisdictions?
- A26. The HEAL RFP is open to all cities that meet the minimum mandatory requirements in RFP, Paragraph 1.4 and do not fall under the Eligibility Exclusions as stated in Paragraph 1.5. Although experience is a scored criterion, DPH doesn't have a preference to select cities that have a certain level of experience in nutrition. Recommendations for funding will be based solely on the outcome of the selection process as described in RFP, Paragraph 3.1, Selection Process.
- Q27. In order to develop a timeline that works with a school year, it would be helpful to know what the funding date is anticipated to be. Can you please provide that information?
- A27. Pursuant to RFP, Paragraph 1.15, Final Contract Award by the Board of Supervisors, DPH anticipates a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors in early 2013.

Addendum Number 2 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) FOR HEALTHY EATING ACTIVE LIVING INITIATIVES Mandatory Intent to Apply Submission List

Number	Organization Name	Business Address
1.	Advancement Project	Los Angeles 90026
2.	Alliance for a Better Community	Los Angeles 90017
3.	AltaMed Health Services	Los Angeles 90040
4.	Beach Cities Cycling Club	Manhattan Beach 90266
5.	BREATHE California Los Angeles County	Los Angeles 90036
6.	Buddhist Tzu Chi Medical Foundation	South El Monte 91733
7.	Burbank Community YMCA	Burbank 91502
8.	California Center for Public Health Advocacy	Baldwin Park 91706
9.	California Walks	El Segundo 90245
10.	Cangress	Los Angeles 90013
11.	Centinela Valley Union High School District	Lawndale 90260
12.	Central City Neighborhood Partners	Los Angeles 90017
13.	Charles R. Drew University of Medicine & Science	Los Angeles 90059
14.	Children's Collective Inc.	Los Angeles 90044
15.	Ciclavia	Los Angeles 90010
16.	City of Baldwin	Baldwin Park 91706
17.	City of Bell	Bell 90201
18.	City of Bell Gardens	Bell Gardens 90201
19.	City of Commerce	Commerce 90040
20.	City of Cudahy	Cudahy 90201
21.	City of Duarte	Duarte 91010
22.	City of Huntington Park with Communities for a Better Environment	Huntington Park 90255
23.	City of Huntington Park with Los Angeles Unified School District	Huntington Park 90255
24.	City of La Puente	La Puente 91744
25.	City of Lancaster	Lancaster 93534
26.	City of Long Beach	Long Beach 90802
27.	City of Lynwood with From Lot to Spot	Lynwood 90262
28.	City of Lynwood with Recreation and Community Services Department	Lynwood 90262
29.	City of Pomona	Pomona 91766
30.	City of Santa Monica	Santa Monica 90407
31.	City of South Gate	South Gate 90280
32.	City of South Pasadena	South Pasadena 91030
33.	City Project	Los Angeles 90017
34.	Community Coalition for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment	Los Angeles 90044
35.	Community Harvest Foundation	Los Angeles 90056
36.	Community Health Alliance of Pasadena	Pasadena 91105
37.	Community Health Councils, Inc.	Los Angeles 90008
38.	Community Partners for Move LA	Los Angeles 90014
39.	Community Services Unlimited, Inc.	Los Angeles 90062

Addendum Number 2 Attachment 2 August 6, 2012 Page 2 of 3

40.	Compton Unified School District	Compton 90220
41.	Day One, Inc.	Pasadena 91101
42.	Esperanza Community Housing Corporation	Los Angeles 90012
43.	FAME Assistance Corporation	Los Angeles 90018
44.	Family Health Care Centers of Greater Los Angeles	Bell Gardens 90201
45.	FAST – Fixing Angelenos Stuck in Traffic	Los Angeles 90071
46.	Friends of Mark Twain/Mark Twain Middle School	Santa Monica 90405
47.	Friends of Mt. Carmel of Long Beach Cambodian Wellness Coalition	Long Beach 90804
48.	Gang Alternatives Program	Wilmington 90744
49.	Glendale Unified School District	Glendale 91206
50.	Green LA Coalition	Los Angeles 90012
51.	Inglewood Unified School District	Inglewood 90301
52.		Los Angeles 90026
53.	John Wesley County Hospital	<u> </u>
	Lawndale Elementary School District	Lawndale 90260
54.	Lenny Krayzelburg Foundation	Los Angeles 90036
55.	LA's BEST After School	Los Angeles 90012
56.	Los Angeles Care Health Plan	Los Angeles 90017
57.	Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition	Los Angeles 90014
58.	Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition for South Bay Bicycle Coalition	Los Angeles 90014
59.	Los Angeles County Library Foundation	San Dimas 91733
60.	Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative	Los Angeles 90017
61.	Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust	Los Angeles 90015
62.	LA Trust for Children's Health	Los Angeles 90017
63.	Montebello Unified School District	Montebello 90640
64.	Neighborhood Youth Achievers	Los Angeles 90002
65.	New Greater Circle Mission Inc.	Los Angeles 90044
66.	North East Trees, Inc.	Los Angeles 90065
67.	Pacoima Beautiful	Pacoima 91331
68.	Pasadena Community Christian Fellowship	Pasadena 91105
69.	Playworks Education Energized	Los Angeles 90013
70.	Proyecto Pastoral at Dolores Mission	Los Angeles 90033
71.	Redondo Beach Unified School District	Redondo Beach 90277
72.	Rowland Unified School District	La Puente 91744
73.	San Fernando Valley Partnership, Inc.	San Fernando 91340
74.	San Gabriel Valley Conservation and Services Corps	El Monte 91731
75.	Social Justice Learning Institute	Manhattan Beach 90266
76.	Sol Adventurers Foundation	Los Angeles 90019
77.	South Bay Bicycle Coalition, Inc.	Manhattan Beach 90266
78.	South Bay Center for Counseling with Harbor Gateway	Gardena 90248
70.	South Bay Center for Counseling with Los Angeles	El Segundo 90245
	Unified School District	-
80.	South Bay Cities Council of Governments	Torrance 90501
81.	Special Services for Groups	Los Angeles 90017
82.	Sprouts of Promise	Santa Monica 90405

Addendum Number 2 Attachment 2 August 6, 2012 Page 3 of 3

83.	Steelworkers Oldtimers Foundation	Huntington Park 90255
84.	Strategic Actions for a Just Economy	Los Angeles 90007
85.	Sustainable Economic Enterprises of Los Angeles	Los Angeles 90028
86.	Synergy Community Development Corporation	Glendale 91205
87.	UCLA Department of Pediatrics	Los Angeles 90095
88.	The University Corporation	Northridge 91330
89.	Valley Care Community Consortium	Van Nuys 91405
90.	Vermont Village Community Development Corporation	Los Angeles 90044
91.	Violence Intervention Program, Community Mental	Los Angeles 90031
	Health Center, Inc.	
92.	Volunteers of East Los Angeles, Inc.	Los Angeles 90022
93.	Watts Labor Community Action Committee	Los Angeles 90059
94.	Wellness Center at Historic General Hospital	Los Angeles 90033
95.	Woodcraft Rangers	Los Angeles 90015
96.	YMCA Metropolitan Los Angeles	Los Angeles 90023
97.	YWCA Greater Los Angeles	Los Angeles 90015
98.	YWCA San Gabriel Valley	Covina 91724