

TRANSMITTAL

To:

THE COUNCIL

Date: 02/29/2016

From:

THE MAYOR

TRANSMITTED FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION. PLEASE SEE ATTACHED.



(Ana Guerrero)

ERIC GARCETTI
Mayor



Eric Garcetti, Mayor
Rushmore D. Cervantes, General Manager

Community Services & Development Bureau
1200 West 7th Street, 9th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017
tel 213.928.9071 | fax 213.808.8999
hcidla.lacity.org

February 26, 2016

Council File: 15-0697
Council District(s): Citywide
Contact Persons:
Olivia Mitchell (213) 808-8872
Suzette Flynn (213) 808-8580
Rushmore Cervantes (213) 808-8808

The Honorable Eric Garcetti
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Room 303, City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attention: Mandy Morales, Legislative Coordinator

TRANSMITTAL: REQUEST TO APPROVE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS AND EXECUTE CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO THE RESULTS OF THE FAMILYSOURCE CENTER (FSC) OPERATORS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

SUMMARY

The General Manager of the Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) respectfully requests that the Mayor and the City Council approve HCIDLA's recommended contractors selected through the FamilySource Center (FSC) Operators Request for Proposal (RFP) process; requests authority to negotiate and execute contracts with the 16 selected contractors; and requests authority to establish a FSC Replacement Operator list based on this procurement process. All initial contracts will commence April 1, 2016 and end March 31, 2017, with the option to renew for up to four additional one-year terms, not to exceed a total of five years. Contract extensions will be subject to contractor performance reviews, funding availability, and Mayor and City Council approval.

Requests are made pursuant to the results of the FSC Request for Proposal process approved by the Mayor and City Council on July 2, 2015 (C.F. No. 15-0697).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The General Manager, Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) respectfully requests that:

1. Your office schedule this transmittal before the appropriate Committee(s) of the City Council at the next available meeting(s), and forward it to the City Council for consideration and approval immediately thereafter.
2. The Mayor and City Council:
 - A. APPROVE HCIDLA's list of recommended contractors selected through the FSC Operator RFP process (Attachment A)
 - B. AUTHORIZE the General Manager, HCIDLA, or his designee, to negotiate and execute new contracts with the 16 recommended contractors to operate the FamilySource Centers for the period of April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, including an option to renew the contract for four additional one-year periods, not to exceed a total of five years, subject to the approval of the City Attorney as to form.
 - C. AUTHORIZE the General Manager HCIDLA, or designee, to establish a FSC Operator Replacement list to be in effect for five years commencing July 1, 2016, to include any FSC proposer receiving a score of 70 points or greater, including non-funded proposers, as a result of the 2016 FSC RFP (see Attachment C). INSTRUCT HCIDLA to report back to the City Council before the implementation of any portion of said list.
 - D. AUTHORIZE the General Manager, HCIDLA, or his designee, to negotiate and execute a new one year contract, with four one-year options to renew, with the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) for an annual cost not to exceed \$1.0 million, on a sole source basis, with a dollar for dollar salary match provided by the LAUSD, for continued services including co-location of Pupil Services and Attendance Counselors at the FSCs, subject to the approval of the City Attorney as to form.
 - E. INSTRUCT the City Administrative Officer to include in the 2016-17 budget, \$3,785,000 in General Funds for five FSC Operators that will not have CDBG or CSBG funding, and to allocate such amount to Fund 100/43, Contractual Services Account 003040 on July 1, 2016, for the period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.
 - F. INSTRUCT the Controller to transfer \$946,000 from the Reserve Fund to the Unappropriated Balance and appropriate a like amount therefrom to HCIDLA Fund 100/43, Contractual Services Account 003040 for five FSC Program Operators that will not have CDBG or CSBG funding, for services from April 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016.
 - G. AUTHORIZE the General Manager, HCIDLA, or his designee to prepare Controller instructions and any necessary technical adjustments consistent with the Mayor and City Council action, subject to approval of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) and authorize the Controller to implement the instructions.

BACKGROUND

The FamilySource System (FSS) is a place-based model with the FamilySource Centers (FSCs) strategically located within highly impoverished areas of the City. The FSS is the City's mechanism for the delivery of anti-poverty services and initiatives. Established in 2009, the FSS is comprised of 19 FSCs, three managed directly by the City and 16 managed by nonprofit, community-based organizations. FSCs are comprised of a lead agency/operator with funded and non-funded partners. All provide a common menu of social services with a target population of low and moderate income parents and guardians with children up to the age of 18. Since its

inception, the FSS has functioned as a performance-driven, outcome-oriented system with two primary measures of success: increased family income and increased academic achievement. HCIDLA plans to continue with a place-based model but refine it to better respond to the evolving needs of City residents. The FSS model will have a refined focus on the “financial empowerment” of adult customers and “educational attainment” for adults and youth. The two primary outcomes are:

1. Improve the financial capability of low-income residents;
2. Increase the education attainment of youth and adults.

HCIDLA solicited proposals from qualified community-based and non-profit organizations to provide all of the core services identified below either directly, via referral or through funded and/or unfunded partner organizations.

FamilySource Center Menu of Core Services

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Information and Referral | Employment & Training Services | Income Tax Preparation Assistance |
| Intake and Eligibility | Early Learning | Individual Development Accounts |
| Assessment | Fair Housing Workshops | Mental Health Counseling |
| Individual Service Strategy Development | Financial Coaching | Mentoring/Counseling |
| Case Management | Financial Literacy | Multi-Benefit Screening |
| Adult Education | First Time Homebuyer Workshops | Parenting Skills |
| Arts Education | Gang Prevention & Intervention | Rent Stabilization Workshops |
| Child Care | Handyworker & Healthy Homes | Shelter for Victims of Domestic Violence |
| College Corner | Homeless Services | Summer Youth Employment |
| Computer Literacy | Immigration Services | Tutoring |
| | Transition to Middle & High School | |

Proposed Service Areas

With a mission of moving low income City residents onto a pathway out of poverty and preparing low income youth to graduate from high school and qualify for post-secondary education, the percent of families with children below the poverty level was selected as the primary indicator in developing the proposed service areas. The proposed service areas, sorted with number 1 representing the area identified as having the greatest need, are:

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Westlake/Pico Union | 2. South East/Watts |
| 3. South West | 4. South East |
| 5. El Sereno/Lincoln Heights | 6. Boyle Heights |
| 7. South West/Florence | 8. Van Nuys |
| 9. West Adams | 10. Hollywood |
| 11. Wilshire | 12. Pacoima |
| 13. Wilmington/San Pedro | 14. Echo Park/Cypress Park |
| 15. Westside | 16. Canoga Park |

Release of Request for Proposals

The RFP was released on Monday, July 27, 2015. Proposals were due on Monday, September 21, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. Two Mandatory Proposers’ Conferences were held – the first on Thursday, August 6, 2015 and the second

on Tuesday, August 11, 2015. Technical assistance was provided by posting answers to questions submitted by proposers on the Los Angeles Business Assistance Virtual Network (LABAVN) website.

Proposal Review Process

A total of thirty-one (31) proposals were received. However, one was not evaluated as it did not pass the threshold review requirements. Twenty (20) evaluators, consisting of City staff other than HCIDLA FSC program staff and other outside human service professionals, were recruited to review the proposals. The evaluators participated in an orientation meeting, where they received an overview of the RFP, received training on the scoring criteria and tool, and were asked to review and sign the Conflict of Interest/Non-Disclosure Statement. The evaluators reviewed and evaluated the proposals using the evaluation tool provided by HCIDLA and based upon the following evaluation criteria as established in the RFP:

- Demonstrated Ability – 30 points
- Program Design – 40 points
- Facility Location and Suitability – 5 points
- Strategic Planning and Sustainability – 5 points
- Cost Reasonableness, Leveraged Resources and Financial Viability – 20 points

Teams of two evaluators reviewed and scored each proposal individually, after which the evaluator teams were convened approximately two weeks later to discuss their individual scores with the other evaluators to arrive at a final consensus score. Evaluation of the proposals included the review of the “Proposed FSC Facility - Exhibit 8” as submitted by each proposer and site visit results. Site visits were conducted by outside evaluators and HCIDLA staff for all eligible proposers to review the readiness of the proposed FamilySource Center facility site in accordance with the facility guidelines outlined in the RFP.

However, subsequent to the release of the FSC RFP, it was determined that in order to ensure that any proposed facility meets all federal accessibility requirements, the facility would need to be surveyed for compliance with the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS). As such, all proposals were awarded the maximum five points for the “Facility Location and Suitability” evaluation factor, given that certified accessibility specialists had not yet evaluated the proposed FSC sites. The contracts approved through this transmittal will require a temporary accessibility accommodation plan, if necessary, to ensure the ability of the proposers to provide fully accessible services.

Appeals Process

On December 16, 2015 proposers were notified of the proposal review results. The notification letter indicated whether a proposer would be recommended for a funding award or not. The notification letter also included a discussion of the appeals process. All proposers were advised that appeals must be based upon specific facts demonstrating that the RFP criteria or process were not followed in the review of proposals; a disagreement with or objection to the points awarded is not sufficient basis for an appeal; and that differences of opinion about the merits of a proposal are not grounds for submitting an appeal.

On January 14, 2016, an Appeals Panel was convened for the purpose of considering three (3) requests for appeals submitted by proposers to the FSC Operators RFP. The Panel was comprised of two members of the Community Action Board (CAB) and one member of the Commission on Community and Family Services (CCFS). The Panel considered appeals from the following proposers:

- Coalition of Mental Health Professionals, Inc.
- Community Build
- Volunteers of America Los Angeles

At the conclusion of the hearings, the Appeals Panel upheld the Department's recommendations and denied all three appeals. In accordance with the RFP guidelines, the Appeals Panel decision is considered final (see Attachment D).

Community Action Board Action

The FamilySource Center Operators funding recommendations, including the summary of appeals, were presented to and approved by the Community Action Board (CAB) on January 19, 2016.

Contractor Recommendations

To provide comprehensive services equally throughout the city, HCIDLA recommends funding all 16 contractors identified in Attachment A at \$800,000 each for the term of April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, with the option to renew contracts for four additional one-year terms, not to exceed five years, contingent upon contractor performance, funding availability, and Mayor and City Council approval. Attachment B contains a detailed list of proposers' scores.

Establishment of a Replacement Operator List

In addition to approving the 16 recommended FSC contractors, the HCIDLA requests authority to establish a pre-qualified list of Replacement Operators (Attachment C). The Replacement Operator List will consist of agencies, both recommended for funding and those not selected, that attained a proposal score of 70 points or greater. Inclusion on the list will qualify a proposer for consideration as a FamilySource operator in the event that an established contractor is no longer able to fulfill its contractual responsibilities.

Recommended Funding

It is recommended that successful proposers be funded at \$800,000 each with the number of FSCs to be based on the service needs of the proposed, poverty concentration, and fund availability. The proposed funding level of \$800,000 is the minimum amount that will allow for services to be subcontracted out by the FSC operators to providers of immigration and other services that are included in the FSS menu of services. The \$800,000 will also allow for appropriate case management staffing and matching funds for Individual Development Accounts. The latter will assist participants in saving for educational purposes, the establishment of a business, purchase of a home or other asset building efforts.

HCIDLA also recommends continued funding of \$1,000,000 annually for the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), on a sole source basis, with a dollar for dollar salary match provided by the LAUSD, for continued services including co-location of Pupil Services and Attendance Counselors at the non-profit managed FSCs. This funding covers 50% of the direct salaries for 16 counselors and two supervisors. LAUSD would match the remaining 50% of direct salaries plus 100% of any benefits and overhead costs.

Finally, HCIDLA uses the services of The University Corporation of California State University Northridge (CSUN) to evaluate the program and quantify the economic impact of services provided on families and their surrounding communities. HCIDLA recommends continued funding of \$60,000 per year for these evaluation services.

In total, the annual cost for operating the proposed 16 sites of the FamilySource System is \$13,860,000, excluding administrative oversight costs. This cost is comprised of the following:

- \$12.8 million for 16 contracts with FSCs (\$800,000 each)
- \$1.0 million for LAUSD
- \$60,000 for evaluation services

Funding identified for this program for Program Year 42, April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, is \$10,075,868. This funding is comprised of the following:

| Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding | 2016 Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Funding | 2015 CSBG Savings | Anticipated 2017 CSBG Funding (Jan-Mar) | Total Grant Funding Available |
|--|--|-------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| \$5,000,000 | \$3,505,250 | \$368,868 | \$1,201,750 | \$10,075,868 |

The difference between the annual funding needed and the available Grant funds is \$3,785,000. Therefore, HCIDLA requests that the shortfall be funded from the General Fund to be used to support the five FSC operators who serve the areas with the lowest percentage of families in poverty (Poverty Areas 11-16) as follows:

| Amount | Source | Term | Program Year | Fiscal Year |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| \$946,000 | General Fund – Reserve Fund | April 1, 2016 – June 30, 2016 | 42 | 15-16 |
| \$2,839,000 | General Fund – 16-17 Budget | July 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016 | 42 | 16-17 |
| \$946,000 | General Fund – 16-17 Budget | April 1, 2016 – June 30, 2016 | 43 | 16-17 |

Included in this request is an additional three months of funding in the 2016-17 Budget for April 1, 2017 – June 30, 2017 to ensure continuity of services in the next program year, which begins on April 1, 2017. This additional funding is needed since these contractors will rely on General Funds which would not be allocated until July 1, 2017.

A detailed breakdown of the costs and necessary funding for April 1, 2016 – March 31, 2017 is provided in Attachment A.

If the Council supports an annual General Fund commitment of \$3,785,000 as requested, HCIDLA recommends the General Fund portion be allocated to the five FSCs that serve populations with the lowest concentration of poverty (Pacoima, Wilmington/San Pedro, Echo Park/Cypress Park, Westside, and Canoga Park). By allocating the General Fund support this way, the City reserves the right to reduce or change the General Fund allocation, if necessary, in a manner consistent with prioritizing services to those most in need.

Next Steps

The HCIDLA Community Services and Development Bureau has organized a team to plan implementation of the new FamilySource Center Program. The plan focuses on the following:

1. Developing a transition plan for the four (4) FSC sites that will have new operators in 2015-16, including grant close-out and transition of customers to new, or other, FSCs.
2. Updating the local electronic infrastructure and website to be operational by July 1, 2016 to align with new and revised FSC program services and goals.
3. Establishing a schedule that moves the FSC program year successfully from its current April – March to a July – June program year cycle.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The FamilySource Center System is funded with a combination of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) and, beginning in 2014-15, General Funds. The total annual operating cost for the 16 non-profit run centers totals \$13,860,000, of which CDBG will fund approximately \$5.0 million, CSBG will fund approximately \$5.1 million and \$3,785,000 is requested from the General Fund for FY 16-17. In addition, the FSCs will require \$946,000 in General Fund support in the current fiscal year to fund the five centers that will not have CDBG or CSBG funding for the period of April 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016.

Reviewed by:



OLIVIA E. MITCHELL
Assistant Chief Grants Administrator
Community Services Division

Reviewed by:




SUZETTE FLYNN, Director
Community Services Division

Reviewed by:



LAURA K. GUGLIELMO
Executive Officer

Approved by:



RUSHMORE D. CERVANTES
General Manager

RDC:LKG:SF:OEM

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A: FamilySource Center Operator RFP Proposer Funding Recommendations
- Attachment B: FamilySource Center Request for Proposal Scores
- Attachment C: FamilySource Center Replacement Operator Recommendations
- Attachment D: Appeals Summary

FamilySource Center (FSC) Operators
2015 Request for Proposal (RFP)
PY 2016-17 Planned Funding

| Area Poverty Rank | Service Area | Proposed Operator | Council District | CDBG Funds | CSBG Funds | CDBG/ CSBG Total | General Funds Request | FSC Grand Total |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Westlake/Pico Union | Central City Neighborhood Partners | 1 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 2 | South East/Watts | Watts Labor Community Action Committee | 8, 9 & 15 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 3 | South West | El Nido Family Centers | 8 & 9 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 4 | South East | All Peoples Community Center | 9 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 5 | El Sereno/Lincoln Heights | Barrio Action & Family Center | 1 & 14 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 6 | Boyle Heights | El Centro de Ayuda | 14 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 7 | South West/Florence | The Children's Collective | 8 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 8 | Van Nuys | New Economics for Women | 2 & 6 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 9 | West Adams | 1736 Family Crisis Center | 10 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 10 | Hollywood | Youth Policy Institute | 13 | \$ 434,921 | \$ 365,079 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 11 | Wilshire | Bresee Foundation | 10 & 13 | \$ 434,922 | \$ 365,078 | \$ 800,000 | | \$ 800,000 |
| 12 | Pacoima | El Nido Family Centers | 7 | \$ 215,868 | \$ - | \$ 215,868 | \$ 584,132 | \$ 800,000 |
| 13 | Wilmington/San Pedro | Toberman Neighborhood Center | 15 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 800,000 | \$ 800,000 |
| 14 | Echo Park/Cypress Park | El Centro del Pueblo | 1 & 13 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 800,000 | \$ 800,000 |
| 15 | Westside | Latino Resource Organization, Inc. | 11 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 800,000 | \$ 800,000 |
| 16 | Canoga Park | New Economics for Women | 12 & 13 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 800,000 | \$ 800,000 |
| | | FSC Subtotal | | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 4,015,868 | \$ 9,015,868 | \$ 3,784,132 | \$ 12,800,000 |
| | CITYWIDE | Los Angeles Unified School District | Citywide | | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | | \$ 1,000,000 |
| | CITYWIDE | The University Corporation (or TBD Evaluator) | Citywide | | \$ 60,000 | \$ 60,000 | | \$ 60,000 |
| | | | | | | | | \$ - |
| | | Total Planned CSBG/CDBG Grant Funds | | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 5,075,868 | \$ 10,075,868 | | \$ 10,075,868 |
| | | Total Requested City General Funds | | | | | \$ 3,784,132 | \$ 3,784,132 |
| | | Total Proposed FSC PY 2016-17 Funding | | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 5,075,868 | \$ 10,075,868 | \$ 13,860,000 | \$ 13,860,000 |

Highlighted areas reflect new proposed service providers for that area

**FAMILYSOURCE CENTER (FSC) OPERATORS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL SCORES**

ATTACHMENT B

| Proposers by Service Area | Final Score |
|---|-------------|
| 1 Westlake/Pico Union | |
| Central City Neighborhood Partners | 93.5 |
| 2 South East/Watts | |
| Watts Labor Community Action Committee | 88.7 |
| 3 South West | |
| 1. El Nido Family Centers | 98.7 |
| 2. Volunteers of America Los Angeles | 89.5 |
| 3. Central City Neighborhood Partners | 85.0 |
| 4. Community Build, Inc. | 70.0 |
| 4 South East | |
| 1. All Peoples Community Center | 85.0 |
| 2. The Children's Collective, Inc. | 82.0 |
| 3. Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles | 78.5 |
| 4. Latino Resource Organization | 75.9 |
| 5. People Coordinated Services of Southern California | 70.5 |
| 5 El Sereno/Lincoln Heights | |
| Barrio Action Youth & Family Center | 87.5 |
| 6 Boyle Heights | |
| 1. El Centro De Ayuda | 95.5 |
| 2. Volunteers of America Los Angeles | 83.5 |
| 7 South West/Florence | |
| 1. The Children's Collective, Inc. | 83.5 |
| 2. Coalition of Mental Health Professionals, Inc. | 78.8 |
| 3. Community Build, Inc. | 56.0 |
| 8 Van Nuys | |
| New Economics for Women | 78.3 |
| 9 West Adams | |
| 1. 1736 Family Crisis Center | 89.2 |
| 2. Children's Bureau | 87.2 |
| 10 Hollywood | |
| Youth Policy Institute | 86.7 |
| 11 Wilshire | |
| 1. Bresee Foundation | 91.0 |
| 2. Children's Bureau | 90.2 |
| 3. Community Career Development, Inc. | 80.0 |
| 12 Pacoima | |
| El Nido Family Centers | 96.7 |
| 13 Wilmington/San Pedro | |
| 1. Toberman Neighborhood Center | 87.8 |
| 2. 1736 Family Crisis Center | 72.7 |
| 14 Echo Park/Cypress Park | |
| El Centro del Pueblo | 80.8 |
| 15 Westside | |
| Latino Resource Organization, Inc. | 74.4 |
| 16 Canoga Park | |
| New Economics for Women | 90.2 |

**FAMILYSOURCE CENTER (FSC) OPERATORS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

ATTACHMENT C

REPLACEMENT OPERATOR LIST

It is recommended that any proposer awarded a score of 70 points or greater be placed on a "Replacement Operator List." Inclusion on the list will make a proposer eligible for consideration as a FamilySource Center operator in the event that an established contractor is no longer able to fulfill its contractual responsibilities.

- 1 1736 Family Crisis Center
- 2 All Peoples Community Center
- 3 Barrio Action Youth & Family Center
- 4 Bresee Foundation
- 5 Central City Neighborhood Partners
- 6 Children's Bureau
- 7 Coalition of Mental Health Professionals, Inc.
- 8 Community Build, Inc.
- 9 Community Career Development, Inc.
- 10 El Centro De Ayuda
- 11 El Centro del Pueblo
- 12 El Nido Family Centers
- 13 Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles
- 14 Latino Resource Organization
- 15 New Economics for Women
- 16 People Coordinated Services of Southern California
- 17 The Children's Collective, Inc.
- 18 Toberman Neighborhood Center
- 19 Volunteers of America Los Angeles
- 20 Watts Labor Community Action Committee
- 21 Youth Policy Institute

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

2015 FAMILYSOURCE CENTERS (FSC) OPERATORS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

SUMMARY OF APPEALS
January 14, 2016

| APPELLANT | BASIS FOR APPEAL | HCIDLA RESPONSE TO APPEAL | APPEALS PANEL ACTION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Coalition of Mental Health Professionals, Inc. (CMHP)</p> | <p><u>Impact of Financial Variables</u> Appellant indicates concern that the CMHP Repayment Plan, signed on 9/21/15 by the Assistant Director of the HCIDLA Accounting Division, and the Resolution of the Unearned Grant on Single Audit Report for year ending 12/31/12, might have had some bearing on a fair evaluation of the proposal submitted for the South West/Florence area.</p> | <p>The Department recommends that the appeal be denied. While proposers were required to submit copies of their most recent single audit and audited financial statements, this information was only considered as a qualifying factor and the appellant met that requirement. Furthermore, the additional financial variables mentioned by the appellant had no bearing on the evaluation of its proposal.</p> | <p>Upheld HCIDLA's recommendation that appeal be denied Approved 3-0</p> |
| <p>Community Build (South West & South West/Florence areas)</p> | <p><u>Issue 1: Evaluation Criteria</u> Appellant states that the "Evaluation Criteria is openly subjective, allowing the HCIDLA to include or exclude Proposer's responses, without explanation or standards." Appellant cites the Evaluation Criteria set forth on page 16 of the RFP which indicates that "Proposals shall be evaluated based on the following categories and may include consideration of any or all of the listed factors at the City's sole discretion."</p> | <p>The Department recommends that the appeal be denied. The RFP on page 18 stipulates that "Proposers may appeal procedural issues only." It was further clarified via an email message sent to all proposers on 12/18/15 that such appeals must be based upon specific facts demonstrating that the RFP criteria or process were not followed in the review of proposals. A disagreement or objection to the points received is not sufficient basis for an appeal. Differences of opinion about the merits of a proposal are not grounds for submitting an appeal. The appellant is challenging the City's subjective discretion and discretion is not a procedural issue. Furthermore, the appellant has not provided any evidence that the RFP evaluation criteria or process were not followed in the review of its proposals. Proposers were provided with information on the evaluation criteria and scoring per pages 16-17 of the RFP. Evaluators used that same criterion to evaluate responses to the RFP narrative questions as submitted by all proposers.</p> | <p>Upheld HCIDLA's recommendation that appeal be denied Approved 3-0</p> |

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

2015 FAMILYSOURCE CENTERS (FSC) OPERATORS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

SUMMARY OF APPEALS
January 14, 2016

| APPELLANT | BASIS FOR APPEAL | HCIDLA RESPONSE TO APPEAL | APPEALS PANEL ACTION |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p><u>Issue 2: Proposal Review Process</u></p> <p>Appellant states that “A Proposal Review Process that is the result of tainted Evaluation Criteria is also tainted.” “The score received by Proposer, specifically in the area of Program Design (4 out of 40), is inconsistent with the overall scoring, and defies logic ...”.</p> | <p>The Department recommends that the appeal be denied. As mentioned previously, a disagreement or objection to the points received is not sufficient basis for an appeal. Differences of opinion about the merits of a proposal are not grounds for submitting an appeal. The appellant did not identify how it believed that the City did not follow its review process, but rather disagreed with the scoring of its proposals.</p> | <p>Upheld HCIDLA’s recommendation that appeal be denied</p> <p>Approved 3-0</p> |
| | <p><u>Issue 3: Proposal Appeal Process</u></p> <p>Appellant states that the Proposal Appeal Process and the Review Panel are tainted, as the “Review Panel relies on the arbitrary and non-transparent review by HCIDLA.”</p> | <p>The Department recommends that the appeal be denied. The appellant appears to be prematurely anticipating the result of their appeal request before it has been considered by the Appeals Panel.</p> | <p>Upheld HCIDLA’s recommendation that appeal be denied</p> <p>Approved 3-0</p> |
| <p>Volunteers of America of Los Angeles (South West area)</p> | <p><u>Part 4: Strategic Planning and Sustainability</u></p> <p>Appellant submitted two proposals – one each for the Boyle Heights and South West areas. Appellant states that the narrative and attachments for Part 4: Strategic Planning and Sustainability of the proposals were identical. The proposals received different scores for the two proposals, though the sections had identical text and, therefore, the appellant concludes that there is “a flaw in the scoring process used by reviewers to result in equitable scores across proposals.”</p> | <p>The Department recommends that the appeal be denied. The RFP on page 18 stipulates that “Proposers may appeal procedural issues only.” It was further clarified via an email message sent to all proposers on 12/18/15 that such appeals must be based upon specific facts demonstrating that the RFP criteria or process were not followed in the review of proposals. A disagreement or objection to the points received is not sufficient basis for an appeal. Differences of opinion about the merits of a proposal are not grounds for submitting an appeal.</p> | <p>Upheld HCIDLA’s recommendation that appeal be denied</p> <p>Approved 3-0</p> |