

# TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE



## **Addendum No. 1** **April 12, 2017**

### **RFQ 2017-18 TxCDBG-CFC Request for Qualifications Application to Prequalify Grant Administrators for as-needed Grant Writing and Administrative Services**

All requirements of RFQ 2017-18 TxCDBG-CFC released on March 31, 2017, except those specifically changed by this Addendum, shall remain in effect. In the event of any inconsistency between information provided in RFQ 2017-18 TxCDBG-CFC released on March 31, 2017, and information in this Addendum, the information in this Addendum shall prevail.

Addendum No. 1 contains questions submitted by interested parties and TDA's responses. These responses shall clarify the requirements of the RFQ.

*Question 1:* Is there any limit or restriction to the number, length or content of attachments we submit along with the Application form (other than the 10MB maximum for email submittals)?

*Response 1:* TDA will not accept/publish any attachments to the Application. Any additional information necessary may be provided to communities during the Phase 2 process.

*Question 2:* Regarding the Application to Prequalify Grant Administrators, under Question 8, please define or provide examples of "types of measures".

*Response 2:* "Types of Measures" means types of activities undertaken by the grant administrator on a project. For example, the types of measures/activities on a housing rehabilitation project may include assistance in drafting proposed Housing Rehabilitation Guidelines; developing and processing applications from homeowners, verifying property ownership, determining income eligibility for each application, etc.

*Question 3:* Should counties that intend to administer the CFC project using county employees submit an Application to Prequalify Grant Administrators?

*Response 3:* No, only firms or individuals seeking to be procured to provide administrative services through a contract with a community must submit an Application to Prequalify Grant Administrators. However, TDA may request similar information in the future from communities

that intend to self-administer a grant contract, and Councils of Government that offer administrative services as a subrecipient to a community, in order to ensure administrative capacity.

*Question 4:* Since each county can submit two CFC applications, could they select different administrators for each submittal?

*Response 4:* A county may choose to solicit for one administrator for one or more applications, or may solicit for each CFC grant application separately. This may occur especially if the county is considering a specialized project, such as housing rehabilitation. The number of CFC grant applications to be prepared should be clearly identified in the Phase 2 solicitation.

*Question 5:* Is Form Pilot-506 the only required form to be sent by communities during Phase 2?

*Response 5:* Yes, a form similar to the DRAFT Form Pilot-506 will be the only required form communities will use to solicit project-specific proposals from pre-qualified firms.

*Question 6:* Form 506 requires the community to enter a "description of anticipated project(s)". Would it be permissible for a community to leave this field blank, or to enter a description such as "eligible CDBG activities in one or more eligible colonias?" A project cannot be officially defined until the community conducts the public hearing, and communities almost always complete the hearing and project decision-making with their administrator's assistance after the administrator is selected.

*Response 6:* A community may state "unknown", list several potential projects, or identify a general need such as "water improvements". If a community is considering a specialized project, such as housing rehabilitation, TDA highly recommends identifying this need during the Phase 2 solicitation.

*Question 7:* In the Evaluation Criteria section, the form instructs the community to mark the importance of each scoring criteria, but it does not provide scoring weights for the "relative importance" (see Comment 1 under Form 508). Subjective criteria here and in Form 508 will make it difficult for communities to provide an objective process for identifying and selecting an administrator. We suggest modifying this form to instruct points be assigned to each criterion.

*Response 7:* TDA will consider all suggestions for this pilot process.

*Question 8:* In the Evaluation of Proposals section, the form instructs the community to mark how well a proposal meets the standard for each scoring criteria, but the scale does not appear to consider their selections on Form Pilot-506 for relative importance. Communities may find identifying and justifying their recommendation difficult without using objective numerical values.

*Response 8:* TDA will consider all suggestions for this pilot process.

*Question 9:* The form requests an explanation if firm selected differs from firm recommended; however the form does not include a place for the evaluation team to name the recommended firm, just a place for the selected firm.

*Response 9:* TDA will consider all suggestions for this pilot process.

*Question 10:* Does the City of Port Arthur qualify for Colonia CDBG construction funding?

*Response 10:* Participation in the Texas CDBG program is limited to non-entitlement areas of the state (small cities and counties). Entitlement communities, such as the City of Port Arthur, receive CDBG funding directly from HUD. Additionally, only counties with unincorporated communities located within 150 miles of the Texas-Mexico border are eligible to apply for Colonia funding under the Texas CDBG program. Jefferson County is not located within that 150-mile radius.