DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
714/744 P STREET
P.O. BOX 942732
SACRAMENTO, CA 94234-7320
(916) 327-5425

August 30, 2000

TO: Prospective Applicants

SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) #00-90916
"EVALUATION OF THE IN-SCHOOL, TOBACCO USE
PREVENTION EDUCATION PROGRAM"

We received over 30 written questions from four organizations relating to the Request for Proposal (RFP) #00-90916 entitled, "Evaluation of the In-School, Tobacco Use Prevention Education Program." One or two questions dealt with policy considerations of the State of California and were outside the scope of the RFP.

Some of the questions requested clarification of information provided at the bidder's conference held on August 15, 2000, that the writer believed conflicted with or contradicted information contained in the RFP. As we stated several times at the conference, should such a situation occur, the written information contained in the RFP is controlling. No clarification beyond that is needed.

Enclosed are the questions received in writing by August 18, 2000, and their corresponding reference to the RFP that addresses its focus of concern.

If you should have any other inquiries/clarifications, please refer to the RFP. The Department of Health Services (DHS)/Tobacco Control Section (TCS) will not be entertaining any other inquiries on this RFP.

Dileep G. Bal, M.D., Chief
Cancer Control Branch

Enclosure

1. **The RFP on page 25, in paragraph j, indicates that bidders can claim Operating Costs (as long as they are not indirect.) What does that mean? As presented in the RFP, the examples you list are Operating Costs related to projects other than the proposed project. Therefore, as such, they are indirect, aren't they?**

   There is no paragraph j. on page 25. Paragraph j. on page 24 is repeated below. Operating expenses are **direct expenses related to** fulfilling the contract deliverables such as office supplies, postage, duplication, communications and space rental.

   j. Indirect Expenses

   Indirect Expenses are costs that are **not directly associated with** the project's deliverables. Examples of Indirect Expenses are: management and fiscal personnel (e.g., Executive Director, Deputy Director, Attorney, Bookkeeper), bookkeeping and payroll services, utilities, building and equipment maintenance, janitorial services, insurance costs and any expenses related to the mandatory annual Financial and Compliance audit.

   Provide a list of all Indirect Expenses charged to this contract and the dollar amount requested. Indirect Expenses CANNOT EXCEED 25 percent of the Total Personnel Expenses (Personnel Costs plus Fringe Benefits).

   Source: RFP #00-90916, page 24, emphasis added.

---

2. **On page 25, in paragraph j, the RFP places a 25 percent ceiling in Indirect Costs. It also appears to encourage bidders to break out elements of Indirect Costs and allocate them to Operating Costs, to remove them from the indirect cost pool. However, as a Federal contractor, our organization, like essentially all of the firms present at the bidders conference, has an indirect rate that is annually reviewed and re-set by the Federal government. If we cap Indirect Costs on this project, all our other clients must absorb the difference, making all of our other Federal jobs unreasonably more expensive to the government. Moreover, as a Federal contractor, we have filed cost accounting disclosure statement with Federal government, which annually approves our indirect and administrative costs. Our approved cost accounting disclosure statement prohibits our moving items that have been approved as indirect into direct operating expenses. For example, we would be prohibited from billing rent as direct on one job without doing it on all jobs. Basically, this provision discriminates against firms whose indirect rates are set by the Federal government in favor of organizations with other types of cost accounting structures. Can those firms with Federally approved indirect rates use those rates? Why does the State discriminate in favor of organizations whose cost accounting structures permit them to allocate Operating Costs to individual contracts as opposed to those that put such costs into Indirect Costs?**

This contract will be between the successful bidder and the State of California. Federal indirect/administrative costs/rates do not apply.

Indirect Expenses **CANNOT EXCEED 25 percent** of the Total Personnel Expenses (Personnel Costs plus Fringe Benefits).

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 24, emphasis added.

---

3. In reference to the statement on page 25, in paragraph j related to the Indirect Costs: many of the normal costs of doing business must be covered by administrative and Indirect Costs. These include costs related to the generation of new business. If this project does not absorb its fair share of these costs, then, in effect, we lose money on this project. We are not talking about the costs of preparing this specific proposal. Rather, we are referring to our Federally-set general and administrative cost rate, which is normally taken on all contracts.

This is not a question. No response required.

---

4. The RFP indicates on page 25 in paragraph j that indirect cost can not exceed 25 percent of the cost of labor plus fringe. Is this bottom line cap? As long as we comply with this bottom line, does it matter to the State that a subset of the total labor + fringe costs exceed 25percent?

Indirect Expenses **CANNOT EXCEED 25 percent** of the Total Personnel Expenses (Personnel Costs plus Fringe Benefits).

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 24, emphasis added.

---

5. Please confirm in writing that fee or profit is to be included under the "other cost." This was stated at the bidders conference, but is not in the RFP.

Other Costs

Additional Expenses:

This line item allows for expenditures that otherwise are not listed in this sample Budget Justification. If you use line items under Additional Expenses, then list them individually and be specific (e.g., fees for renting a meeting room to conduct training or renting a booth at a health fair, etc.). All expenditures for items listed under Additional Expenses must also be referenced in the Scope of Work.

Provide justification and the amount requested for each additional line item.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 23, emphasis added.

---

6. Please confirm that, in the two-year option period referenced in the RFP, there would be no work during the first year, with the second cycle of the survey administered during the second of the two optional years.

3. Contract Award Renewal

The Contract award is for a 12-month period. Proposals must be for the entire period. **CDHS/TCS will have the option of renewing the contract for two additional years** under the same terms and conditions. It is understood that if CDHS/TCS asserts this right, the Scope of Work (and corresponding Budget) will only apply to the **first and third years of the agreement.**

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 9, emphasis added.

---

7. It was indicated at the bidders' conference that the project would span two fiscal years. Is the ceiling for the project a total of $750,000? Or $750,000 per fiscal year?

A maximum of $750,000 is estimated to be available for this RFP. One contract will be awarded for a twelve (12) month period beginning December 1, 2000 and ending November 30, 2001. Proposals submitted must include a contract period for the entire 12 months.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 3, emphasis added.

---

8. The RFP references the use of qualitative data in preparing reports, such as page 2 section C. However, the Statement of Work focuses on the student, principal, and teacher surveys. What sources of qualitative data are expected to be used? What types of community data does the State want bidders to consider using? What is the relative importance of qualitative data in the overall scheme of the evaluation?

A. EVALUATION PLAN

The school evaluation shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of school-based Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE) programs. This assessment of TUPE entitlements and the competitive high school grant projects shall take into account any data and findings of evaluations conducted or funded by CDE. **The evaluation should consider all data that has been previously collected in California schools (such as CDHS/TCS's Independent Evaluation) to help provide a baseline to make comparisons about changes and effectiveness. The evaluation will include an accounting of how monies allocated for the school prevention programs were expended (how much money is budgeted, type of interventions implemented, etc.). The guidelines for evaluating school-based programs outlined in California Health and Safety Code Section 104375 call for an assessment of school-based tobacco use prevention activities, and measurement of student response to these activities. A survey of school districts and schools is to be conducted to describe their tobacco control policies and curricula. The federal Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines for school-based programs and the US Department of Education's principles of effectiveness is to be utilized as the standard to evaluate the extent to which schools in the state are providing "state of the art" tobacco use prevention programming for students. The data also is to be analyzed to determine the relative changes in students' knowledge, attitudes, and behavior as a function of various school-based interventions.**

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

---

9. On page 2, under big paragraph C, please explain how little paragraph c falls under the larger paragraph C.

This is a typographical error. It should read "v" as in "the fifth subparagraph".

---

10. The RFP indicates on page 10 and elsewhere that at the high school level there will be competition for funds, such that unsuccessful bidders and non-applicants become a logical comparison group. Does the State have concerns that the two groups might be systematically different, with the non-recipients of grant funds being less committed to tobacco risk reduction, which could then impact on tobacco use rates in a variety of ways aside from the presence or absence of the interventions funded under this procurement?

> **The school evaluation shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of school-base Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE) programs.** This assessment of TUPE entitlements and the competitive high school grant projects shall take into account any data and findings of evaluations conducted or funded by CDE.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

11.a. On page 6, under E.2.a.(2), budget and budget justification are shown as getting up to 20 points. In addition, the cost proposal is separately scored. Please explain the distinction between these two distinct criteria. On what basis will budget and budget justification be scored?

> **The Budget is a summary of the expenses described in the Budget Justification**. It must be realistic, cost-effective, and appropriate to the proposed Scope of Work. The Budget is the controlling mechanism for expenditures and the basis for approval of invoices.
>
> **The Budget Justification: 1) describes and justifies the expenditures associated with the activities in the Scope of Work, and 2) helps evaluate the Scope of Work and Budget.** Prepare one Budget Justification for the entire contract term.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 17, emphasis added.

> The **lowest Cost Proposal** shall earn 20 points.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 6, emphasis added.

11.b. In addition, it is stated under E.2.b, cost proposal scoring, that the lowest score proposal shall earn 20 points. Do you mean the lowest out of all submissions? Or the lowest that achieves a minimum technical proposal total of 140 points in the initial review process?

To advance to the Cost Proposal scoring stage and to be considered for funding, **proposals must have a minimum technical proposal total score of 140 points.** The "Cost Proposal" is the total amount bid or requested by the applicant.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 6, emphasis added.

---

12. Are we allowed to attach sample proposed questions or instruments to our proposal?

DO NOT PROVIDE ANY MATERIALS THAT ARE NOT REQUESTED. This includes agency brochures, samples of materials, letters of support and pages that go over the minimum number in specified sections with page limits. These materials will be discarded and will not be reviewed.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 16, emphasis in original.

---

13. The RFP indicates in at least two places, such as page 9, section 4, that monthly progress reports must be delivered face to face. However, at the bidders' conference, it was stated that some progress reports could be delivered over the phone. Please resolve this discrepancy.

Progress reports: The contract will call for **10-12 face-to-face reports** (approximately monthly) on progress made in completing the work and meeting the established timelines so that CDHS/TCS can monitor the performance of the contract.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 13, emphasis added.

---

14. Are we expected to submit a separate cost proposal for the two option years? Or do our cost for Year 1 have to remain exactly the same for the option period? This is not clear from the RFP or the bidders conference.

CDHS/TCS will have the option of renewing the contract for two additional years under the **same terms and conditions**. It is understood that if CDHS/TCS asserts this right, the Scope of Work (and corresponding **Budget**) will only apply to the **first** and **third** years of the agreement.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 9, emphasis added.

---

15. On page 10, section B.1, it is indicated that the sample will be twice as large for high schools as for middle schools. Please explain the rationale behind this.

This number of students per region ensures that regional prevalence estimates will have a margin of error at less than 5 percent for middle school and for post-stratified grade levels 9-12.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

In consideration of CDHS/TCS's multiple needs, **this sampling plan has been chosen in consultation with CDC and a sampling statistician who has designed similar sampling plans for other states. Even though other sampling plans may be appropriate, only this sampling plan will be considered** due to time constraints of the sample selection and the need to contact the schools as soon as possible.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 11, emphasis added.

---

16. Please provided budgetary assumptions related to the length of the various instruments, such as page length of each instrument. This will allow bidders to make more reasonable assumptions and is in the State's interest.

The 1996 Independent Evaluation (IE) 8th Grade Student survey had approximately 150 items on it, while the 10th Grade Student survey had approximately 72 items. There were approximately 25 items on the School Site Administrator survey, while the Teacher survey had approximately 62 items, and the District TUPE Coordinator survey had approximately 35 items.

It is anticipated that the survey instruments for 2001 will be similar in length, however, the RFP does allow for the creation of new instruments.

The student tobacco survey instrument will be created from several sources, and with input from several groups. The instrument must contain a minimum core set of questions chosen by CDHS/TCS. Additional items, addressing relevant evaluation and surveillance issues, may be included, but the contractor must work closely with CDHS/TCS and CDC to ensure that the final instrument will satisfy the needs of key stakeholders.

The administrator survey will consist of a core set of questions requested by CDHS/TCS and other questions determined by the contractor, CDHS/TCS, and CDC.

The tobacco use prevention education teacher survey will also consist of a core set of questions that will be required by CDHS/TCS, along with additional questions determined by the contractor, CDHS/TCS and CDC to be pertinent.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 11, emphasis added.

17.a. Does the sampling frame include non-public schools or is it limited to public schools?

The sampling frame will include public and private schools.

CDC will provide the selection of schools, scan the answer sheets and weight the data for the administration of this survey.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

17.b. In addition, on page 10, in B.1., it is indicated that the State will initiate recruitment prior to contract award, and the contractor will take over responsibility for recruitment once the award is made. Does that mean that the State will remove itself entirely from recruitment? OR that, after award, recruitment will be done collaboratively by contractor and the State?

Consequently, **DHS/TCS will notify the selected schools**, inform them about the survey, and try to obtain approval for participation. In December 2000, the contractor will take over these duties from CDHS/TCS when the contract term begins. **Although not responsible for these activities, the contractor will be expected to work with CDHS/TCS and CDC in facilitating them.**

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

17.c. How much support can we expect from the Department of Education? From the Attorney General's office? Can we assume that either or both will provide letters of support?

CDHS/TCS meets regularly with the Department of Education and the Attorney General's office to work on joint issues and projects. This subject is included in these collaborative meetings.

The proposal must adequately describe the following:

(1) School participation: The methods to be used to maximize school participation, such as incentives.
(3) Student participation: The methods to be used to obtain high student participation with the active parental consent requirement.
(4) School administrator and tobacco use prevention education teacher participation: The methods to be used to maximize participation rates among administrators and tobacco education teachers.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 12, emphasis added.

17.d. What actions will be taken prior to the contract award to induce widespread support of the project?

CDHS/TCS meets regularly with the Department of Education and the Attorney General's office to work on joint issues and projects. This subject is included in these collaborative meetings.

The initial contact with the schools will be done by CDHS/TCS from September to November, while the award is being determined and the contract negotiated. **Consequently, DHS/TCS will notify the selected schools, inform them about the survey, and try to obtain approval for participation.** In December 2000, the contractor will take over these duties from CDHS/TCS when the contract term begins.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

17.e. Why does the RFP assume an 85 percent participation rate among schools if the overwhelming majority of schools will be required to participate as a condition of funding?

Assuming an 85 percent participation rate, approximately 360 schools will be surveyed.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

17.f. For costing purposes, what should bidders assume the status of recruitment will be at the moment that the contract is signed and the contractor becomes involved in recruitment?

Consequently, DHS/TCS will notify the selected schools, inform them about the survey, and try to obtain approval for participation. In December 2000, the contractor will take over these duties from CDHS/TCS when the contract term begins. **Although not responsible for these activities, the contractor will be expected to work with CDHS/TCS and CDC in facilitating them.**

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

---

18. Page 13, paragraph 2, indicates that the State wants statewide and county/regional estimates with 95 percent confidence intervals of smoking prevalence, tobacco behaviors, knowledge, attitudes and beliefs by gender, by age, by grade, by smoking status (non-smokers and smokers), and by four race/ethnicity groups (Non-Hispanic White, African-American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander and Others). What level of precision is required in the estimates? Does this paragraph mean that the State estimates for each specified group within each county/region? For example, does this mean that the State expects separate estimates within the specified confidence intervals (at an unspecified precision level) for Asian/Pacific Islanders? If separate estimates are expected within county/region for "others," does that imply the State expects separate estimates for Native Americans (as part of other)?

Thus, the total number of students surveyed statewide will be approximately 18,000, with about 500 middle and 1000 high school students per region. This number of students per region ensures that **regional** prevalence estimates **will have a margin of error at less than 5 percent** for middle school and for post-stratified grade levels 9-12.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

---

19. On page 3, in A.2, it is stated that any organization that receives funding from a tobacco company or affiliate during the contract period is not eligible for funding. This same paragraph excludes universities and colleges. Apparently, universities and colleges are allowed to work directly for tobacco companies, as long as the principal investigator proposed by a university or college does not have an affiliation with such companies. These provisions clearly discriminate and are biased in favor of colleges and universities, since they are excused from the organizational requirement. At the same time, apparently a principal investigator for any organization other than a college or

university can work directly for a tobacco company as long as it is not through the applicant, and this is allowable under the RFP. We cannot see the justification for not applying the same provisions to all applicants and all proposed principal investigators. Please justify or modify your provisions.

> **Any agency**, with the exception of universities and colleges, **that receives funding from, or has an affiliation or contractual relationship with a tobacco company, any of its subsidiaries or parent company during the term of the contract, is not eligible for funding under this RFP.** Agency certification to this effect is required on Attachment 6. See Appendix A for a partial list of tobacco company subsidiaries.
>
> Source: RFP #00-90916, page 3, emphasis added.

The CDHS/TCS conflict of interest language was developed with consultation from federal agencies, other state health departments and universities and colleges. CDHS/TCS believes it provides adequate protection from a conflict of interest. If an issue arises that indicate this conflict of interest language is inadequate, CDHS/TCS will consider the issue and take steps to modify its policy as necessary.

---

20. The RFP indicates on Page 18 under (2) that salaries shall not exceed those paid to State personnel for similar positions/classifications, and in Appendix I the comparable State Civil Service Classifications are provided. The list of comparable classifications does not adequately cover the breadth of positions required for this project. For example, a principal investigator in the research world is often a very senior individual, perhaps the director of a research center or division, who is paid substantially higher than a project director. Please confirm that we have the latitude to add additional position categories not included in the rather limited list provided by the RFP.

> **If any salary exceeds the comparable State salary range, then justify the excess.** Any such justification shall be approved in writing by the State. CDHS/TCS may request additional information during contract negotiations.
>
> Source: RFP #00-90916, page 18, emphasis added.

---

21. Will the resultant contract be a fixed price contract? A reimbursable contract? A cost plus fixed fee contract? Or some other type of contract? Has the State determined this? Or are we free to propose a variety of options?

This is a reimbursable contract. Actual expenses will be reimbursed up to the maximum amount budgeted and approved by the State of California.

A maximum of $750,000 is estimated to be available for this RFP.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 3, emphasis added.

The Budget is the controlling mechanism for expenditures and the **basis for approval of invoices.**

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 17, emphasis added.

---

22. The RFP indicates on page 7, in paragraph 4, that following negotiations, the contractor is required to submit a detailed scope of work, budget, and budget justification prior to full execution of the contract. Is the preparation of the detailed scope of work, budget, and budget justification reimbursable under the contract?

Expenses associated with preparing and submitting a proposal are solely the responsibility of the agency and will not be reimbursed by CDHS/TCS.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 4, emphasis added.

CDHS/TCS reserves the right to withdraw any award if an acceptable Scope of Work, Budget and other CDHS/TCS required forms are not received by CDHS/TCS within 45 calendar days of being negotiated by CDHS/TCS and the awardee.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 7, emphasis added.

The term of the contract is **December 1, 2000** through November 30, 2001.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 15, emphasis added.

---

23. The section on agency capability, described on page 16, is very brief, limited as it is to 5 pages. A wide range of information is to be included in this section, including staff background and experience. May staff resumes also be included as an appendix? At a minimum, does the State want to see the resumes for key staff, such as the principal investigator, project director, etc?

> **DO NOT PROVIDE ANY MATERIALS THAT ARE NOT REQUESTED**. This includes agency brochures, samples of materials, letters of support and pages that go over the minimum number in specified sections with page limits. These materials will be discarded and will not be reviewed.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 16, emphasis in original.

---

24. Are the non-TUPE comparison schools included in the 120 middle schools and the 240 high schools to be surveyed?

> The survey-sampling frame will include 425 schools throughout the state. Assuming an 85 percent participation rate, approximately 360 schools will be surveyed. The **final sample** will include approximately 120 middle schools… and 240 high schools.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

---

25. Is there an expectation regarding the interview technique (i.e. face-to-face, telephone, or mail) to be used when surveying school administrators and tobacco education teachers or is it for the bidder to propose?

> The 1996 Independent Evaluation administered these surveys by mail. The RFP allows for the development of other strategies.
>
> **The proposal must adequately describe** …. the methods used to maximize participation rates among administrators and tobacco education teachers.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 12, emphasis added.

---

26. The RFP stipulates that the surveys to be conducted must be done in a manner that will allow their later replication. Does the TCS anticipate funding similar surveys in later years for purpose of evaluating the TUPE program? [ref:pg.2]

> The department, in consultation with the State Department of Education, **shall conduct, or contract for** an evaluation of the effectiveness of the tobacco use prevention and education program as implemented in the public schools that receive funding for tobacco use prevention education pursuant to Sections 104420, 104425, 104435, and 104445.
>
> Source: RFP #00-90916, page 1, emphasis added.

---

27. If similar surveys are anticipated in future years, will contracts for the associated work be offered via new RFP's [ref:pg 2]

> CDHS/TCS will have the **option** of renewing the contract for two additional years under the same terms and conditions.
>
> Source: RFP #00-90916, page 9, emphasis added.

---

28. Is the work to be conducted under the contract resulting from RFP 00-90916 actually as baseline study for subsequent outcome evaluation of TUPE with the aid of survey data to be collected in future years, OR does TCS expect evaluation of TUPE outcomes to be made utilizing the surveys conducted under the contract resulting from RFP 00-90916? [Ref: pg.2]

> This assessment of TUPE entitlements and the competitive high school grant projects **shall take into account any data and findings of evaluations conducted or funded by CDE. The evaluation should consider all data that has been previously collected in California schools (such as CDHS/TCS's Independent Evaluation) to help provide a baseline to make comparisons about changes and effectiveness.** The evaluation will include an accounting of how monies allocated for the school prevention programs were expended (how much money is budgeted, type of interventions implemented, etc.). The guidelines for evaluating school-based programs outlined in California Health and Safety Code Section 104375 call for an assessment of school-based tobacco use prevention activities, and measurement of student response to these activities. A survey of school districts and schools is to be conducted to describe their tobacco control policies and curricula. The federal Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines for school-based programs and the US Department of

Education's principles of effectiveness is to be utilized as the standard to evaluate the extent to which schools in the state are providing "state of the art" tobacco use prevention programming for students. The data also is to be analyzed to determine the relative changes in students' knowledge, attitudes, and behavior as a function of various school-based interventions.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

---

29. Regarding questions stated in the Analytical Plan section of RFP 00-90916 [Ref: pg.12] are research procedures in addition to the conduct of the surveys referenced in the RFP permitted and/or desired by TCS?

These surveys are to be used **in conjunction with other quantitative and qualitative data** to produce a comprehensive report evaluating the in-school tobacco use prevention education program in California.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 2, emphasis added.

---

30. Does TCS anticipate and/or desire that the surveys referenced in RFP 00-90916 are of predominant importance in answering the questions listed in the Analytical Plan section of the RFP [Ref: pg.12]?

The analytic plan should provide a description and explanation of how the data collected will be analyzed and interpreted to reach answers to the primary evaluation questions. Provide a description of your plan for analyzing the data and evaluation results.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 12, emphasis added.

---

31. Is the Contractor responsible for creating a version of data sets to be released to the public (deliverable #4, page 13 of RFP)? If so, is there any requirements to aggregate the data in order to guarantee confidentiality of respondents or to remove identifying information about individual schools?

The contractor will be required to deliver to CDHS/TCS on CD ROM a data set, accompanying documentation and a technical report in a format which can be readily used and understood by researchers and persons with statistical expertise for analyses and evaluation purposes.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 13, emphasis added.

The report should include frequency tables for responses to all questions and youth smoking and smokeless tobacco prevalence charts by gender, ethnicity and grades for the state as a whole and for the 12 county/regions.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 13.

The proposal must adequately describe the following:

(6) Confidentiality: The procedures used to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of respondent data.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 12, emphasis added.

The contractor **must expressly agree not to release any data** until all deliverables are accepted by CDHS/TCS as satisfactory.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 13, emphasis added.

---

32. Does the sampling strategy over sample any of the minority populations?

CDC will provide the selection of schools, scan the answer sheets and weight the data for the administration of this survey.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 10, emphasis added.

---

33. To what extent will past experience working with CDHS be considered in reviewing Agency Qualifications and Experience?

Describe the agency's fiscal and administrative **ability to manage state government contract funds**. At least three years demonstrated history to handle fiscal and administrative activities related to a government contract are required.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 16, emphasis added.

---

34. The RFP does not ask for resumes of proposed key staff, and there is a note indicating that bidders should not provide any materials that are not requested (page 14 of RFP). However, resumes seem to be standard method for assessing the bidder's qualifications. Can resumes be submitted as attachments?

> **DO NOT PROVIDE ANY MATERIALS THAT ARE NOT REQUESTED**. This includes agency brochures, samples of materials, letters of support and pages that go over the minimum number in specified sections with page limits. These materials will be discarded and will not be reviewed.

Source: RFP #00-90916, page 16, emphasis in original.