

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

BPA NO.

1. CONTRACT ID CODE

PAGE

OF PAGES

1

13

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.

1

3. EFFECTIVE DATE

3/24/2005

4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. jlm

05-0722

5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)

6. ISSUED BY

CODE

U.S. Department of Labor, ETA/OGCM
Division of Contract Services
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Room N4472
Washington DC 20210

7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)

CODE

U.S. Department of Labor, ETA
Division of Contract Services
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Room N4472
Washington DC 20210

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)

To all Offerors

(X)

9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

DOL05RP20025

X

9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)

03/02/2005

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.

10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

CODE

FACILITY CODE

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 0 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment of each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(X) A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

Please see attached

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)

16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)

KEITH A. BOND
Contracting Officer

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR

15C. DATE SIGNED

16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

16C. DATE SIGNED

(Signature of person authorized to sign)

BY _____
(Signature of Contracting Officer)

AMENDMENT NO. 1

CONTINUATION PAGE

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (CONT'D)

ANSWERS TO REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

1. Question: Assuming that the control and treatment groups are randomly assigned in equal sizes, each site has approximately 133 youth in each group. Does ETA consider this sample size sufficient to expect results by site?

Answer: Grantees had to demonstrate they could recruit at least 400 participants- 200 control group members and 100 aftercare participants and 100 alternative sentencing participants. This allocation is subject to change during the design phase. The Department expects that the evaluation contractor will examine impacts by site but does not expect that these impacts will achieve accepted levels of statistical power and confidence.
2. Question: Have all of the interested parties in each site (grantees and court personnel) formally agreed to participate in this evaluation?

Answer: The grantees have formally agreed to participate in this evaluation; the court personnel have not as of yet. The grantees will secure the courts' cooperation with assistance from the evaluation contractor.
3. Question: The RFP states that the six sites that have agreed to participate in the evaluation were given extensions and additional funds in June 2004, but that, "pending availability of funds and satisfactory progress, second year funds may also be available." Without additional funding, then, these grantees will likely exhaust their funds prior to the beginning of this evaluation. Can we assume these sites will receive additional funds that will enable them to continue to provide the necessary services to all the youth in the study sample?

Answer: Yes, you may assume that these sites will receive additional funds that will enable them to continue to provide the necessary services to all the youth in the study sample.
4. Question: The RFP states that the sites selected for this study "are required to allow the evaluation contractor to randomly assign program applicants..." Should we assume that in each of the six sites the courts and legal systems have also agreed to participate and allow the contractor to randomly assign youth offenders?

Answer: While the courts and legal systems have not yet formally agreed to participate, the sites have established relationships with them. The grantees will secure the courts' cooperation with assistance from the evaluation contractor.
5. Question: The RFP states that the Principal Investigator(s) is required to commit 30% of her/his time to the project. Is it acceptable to have co-Principal Investigators whose time taken together equals 30%?

Answer: No. It is not acceptable to have co-Principal Investigators whose time together equals 30%. The Principal Investigator(s) must commit 30% of her/his time to the project.
6. Question: It would be normal for the Project Director or the Principal Investigator to lead the Design Task or the Analyses and Reporting task as part of their duties as project director or principal investigator. Is it permissible for the Project Director or Principal Investigator to lead either of these tasks and commit an amount of time that is less than the sum of the two required amounts (i.e., less than 60% for the Project Director or 50% for the Principal Investigator)?

Answer: Yes. The Project Director must meet the 40% minimum and the Principal Investigator must meet the 30% minimum. However, each Task Leader is assumed only to be leading one task, so if a Task Leader leads multiple tasks, the minimum time commitment is increased commensurately.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

7. Question: The RFP states that the "technical approach factor" is limited to 20 double-spaced, single-sided pages. Can we assume that this limit applies only to the items described under the Technical Approach in RFP Section M.3.A?

Answer: PLEASE NOTE: Pursuant to Section L.10, Part 2 – (2), the 20 page limitation for the technical approach section of the technical proposal shall be disregarded. **There is no page limitation for any parts of the Technical proposal, which includes the technical approach, management plan, understanding, resumes, etc. However, appendices are not permitted.**

8. Question: Can a table showing level of effort by task and sub-task be included as an Appendix to the Technical Approach and, hence, not count against the 20-page limit?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 7. Also, the proposal shall include a table of contents, a table cross-referencing the evaluation criteria and the relevant sections of the proposal and an executive summary not to exceed three pages covering the technical approach only.

9. Question: If the contractor decides to obtain baseline data from the grantee rather than conducting a survey directly, are the grantees prepared (or will DOL obligate them) to administer, with training, an instrument developed by the contractor and then make the data (even if in the form of hard copy questionnaires) available to the contractor?

Answer: The grantees have formally agreed to provide all data requested by the evaluation contractor. Specific data collection arrangements will be worked out during the evaluation's design phase. Please also refer to the answer to Question No. 43.

10. Question: The RFP states the intake process for the evaluation will "last at least one year." Is it DOL's assumption that each of the six sites would be able to obtain a sufficient sample in one year and therefore the intake period will need to be calibrated to last that long? On the other hand, is there some upper limit on the length of intake so that the fielding period remains within a reasonably consistent period across all sites as well?

Answer: The grantees have agreed to recruit at least 400 youth offenders in a year. If the offeror feels this is an insufficient sample size, they should propose a longer intake period in their proposal.

11. Question: Who are the contractors conducting the outcome evaluations of round I and II grantees and the process evaluation of selected round III grantees? Are these contractors and/or Research and Evaluation Associates eligible to bid on this procurement?

Answer: McNeil Technologies (formerly Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc) is the prime contractor for the Phase 3 evaluation; Mathematica Policy Research is the sub-contractor for the outcomes component of the Phase 3 evaluation. These contractors are eligible to bid on this procurement.

12. Question: Section C.2.1. What is the timeline for the outcomes evaluation of round I and II grantees and the process evaluation of selected round III grantees that is currently underway?

Answer: This evaluation is slated to end in December 2005.

13. Question: If there is an overlap of evaluation effort, to what extent will the contractor of this proposed procurement be working cooperatively with the contractor conducting the outcomes (round I and II) and process (round II) evaluation currently underway?

Answer: The Department does not envision any interfacing between the impact evaluation contractor and the Phase Three contractor.

14. Question: Section C.2.2 indicates that "the evaluation will randomly assign young offenders to one of three groups: 1) commitment to a residential facility (incarceration), 2) incarceration with aftercare or 3) alternative sentencing. Are we correct to assume that group one (incarceration) is the control group?"

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Answer: Yes, the incarcerated youth will comprise the control group.

15. Question: Section C.2.2: in the statement "each site is required to provide a sample of at least 400 eligible applicants," what is meant by eligible and who determines eligibility?

Answer: An eligible youth is one who is between 14-18 years old, and being sentenced by a court working with a YODP grantee. Eligibility will thus be determined by the court.

16. Question: Section C.2.2. For the youth offenders participating in this study, what types of criminal violations did they commit?

Answer: Violations include offenses serious enough to warrant incarceration.

17. Question: Section C.4 TASKS, No. 4 Data Collection: In the activity "follow-up interview," who is being interviewed? It is grantee staff and representatives of the relevant court systems?

Answer: The interviewees are the youth assigned to the program and control groups.

18. Question: Section C.4 TASKS, No. 4 Data Collection: What is meant by "at least an 80% response rate" in any survey conducted under the proposed contract? Who are the respondents and what leverage will the contractor have to assure the expected response rate?

Answer: An 80% response rate means that the contractor will locate and collect sufficient information for the analysis from 80% or more of those youth selected for interviews. The program and control group youths' response to the surveys is voluntary; however, the contractor may propose to offer incentives to the youth to encourage responding.

19. Question: Section C.4 TASKS, No. 5 Meetings: Do you expect three meetings that all grantees and court personnel attend, or three meetings in each grantee's location for a total of 18 meetings?

Answer: The Department intends for the contractor to hold three meetings throughout the course of the contract that all grantees and court personnel will attend.

20. Question: Section C.4 TASKS, No. 5 Meetings: Will the contractor be responsible for the travel and per diem costs of grantee and court personnel attending the meetings? If so, for budgeting purposes, please indicate the number of attendees you would expect at each meeting.

Answer: No, the grantees and court personnel will pay the costs associated with attending these meetings. Sites will be directed to budget for such costs.

21. Question: Section C.4 TASKS, No. 5 Meetings: Is the contractor responsible for procuring and paying for meeting space?

Answer: Yes, the contractor is responsible for procuring and paying for meeting space.

22. Question: Section C.6: What is a Task Leader?

Answer: The offeror must propose a project organization that covers each of the tasks listed in Section C.4. A Task Leader has primary responsibility for ensuring a task as defined by the offeror's proposed project organization is completed under the overall direction of the Project Director.

23. Question: What indicators will be used in creating the research design? Have any hypotheses been developed on what is anticipated for each of the three alternatives?

Answer: It is unclear what is meant by "indicators." The Department has hypothesized that treatment will lead to improved labor market outcomes on employment and earnings and reduced recidivism.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

24. Question: What types of activities do the offenders engage in under 1) a residential facility, 2) incarceration with aftercare, and 3) alternative sentencing to enhance the possibility of remunerative livelihoods and reduction of recidivism, i.e., what is the "treatment" each group is given?

Answer: There is a wide range of activities in incarceration, aftercare, and alternative sentencing, and will vary by grantee site and residential facilities. The offeror also can refer to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's website at <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/search/topiclist.asp> for more information on incarceration, aftercare, and alternative sentencing.

25. Question: Since second-year funding "may" be available "pending availability of funds and satisfactory progress" for the six Round Three sites that are proposed to participate in the evaluation:
- Is it safe to assume that these sites will be operating throughout the time it will take to enroll a sufficient number of youth?
 - Is it safe to assume that the sites will continue the treatment intervention through YODP for a reasonable time after the youths are enrolled?
 - Is ETA supplementing the programs with additional funding to ensure that they will be providing services throughout the entire period of the study?

Answer: Yes, the offeror should assume these sites will be operating throughout the time it will take to enroll a sufficient number of youth. Also, the offeror should assume the sites will continue the treatment intervention through YODP for a reasonable time after the youths are enrolled. Additional funding can not be guaranteed in advance but the offeror should assume such funds will be forthcoming.

26. Question: What is the anticipated start date of the evaluation (*i.e.*, beginning of the randomized assignments)?

Answer: January 2006. The Department recognizes this start date may change if there are any delays during the design phase.

27. Question: If a particular site is unable to meet DOL's enrollment specifications, will the other sites be expected to enroll enough youth to yield "a total sample of at least 2,400?"

Answer: Each site has assured the Department they will recruit at least 400 youth; therefore, the sites are not expected to make up any enrollment shortages in other sites.

28. Question: Since the evaluation is premised on a random assignment of young offenders to one of three groups (*i.e.*, incarceration, incarceration with aftercare, and alternative sentencing):

- Have the grantees or DOL already made arrangements with the court systems of the six jurisdictions to participate in this random assignment?
- Should we assume that both the aftercare and alternative sentencing groups will receive services through the relevant Demonstration Project?
- Is each of the six Demonstration Projects already providing aftercare and alternative sentencing services?

Answer: Please see Question 2 for the answer to A. The offerors should assume that both the aftercare and alternative sentencing groups will receive services through the YODP. Additionally, each of the YODP grantees are already providing aftercare and alternative sentencing services.

29. Question: In order to design the random assignment effectively, the contractor will need information on the approximate number of offenders served each year:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

- a. Is historical data available at each of the six Demonstration Project sites?
- b. Do any of the sites have information collected on any changes that have significantly increased or decreased the number of offenders?

Answer: There are some historical data available through December 31, 2004 quantitative quarterly reports (Please see associated links). Sites may have information on changes that have affected the number of offenders, but only as may be collected from a review of their quarterly site narratives.

30. Question: If offenders in the first group are still incarcerated during the 18th month interview, should some allowance be made for possible distortion of the results?

Answer: It is unclear what is meant by "distortion."

31. Question: Are incentives built into the programs to encourage the participants to cooperate with the interviewing process? If not, should such incentives be incorporated into our Technical Approach and Costs?

Answer: Grantees have not included incentives so the contractor may incorporate the use of them into the Technical Approach and Costs.

32. Question: Can Reps and Certs be submitted electronically via the ORCA system?

Answer: Reps and Certs may NOT be submitted electronically via the ORCA system. They must be included in Part 1 of the offeror's proposal.

33. Question: We read the 20-page limitation to address only the Technical Approach (*i.e.*, the 20-page limitation does not apply for other required sections, such as the Management Plan, Understanding, Resumes, and Letters of Intent):

- a. Are we correct in interpreting the 20-page limitation as applying only to the Technical Approach?
- b. Is it acceptable to use appendices to illustrate points made in the Technical Approach?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 7.

34. Question: Re the Understanding section:

- a. Does the Understanding section need to be placed at the end of the Technical Proposal or can we present it at the beginning to provide context for the Technical Approach?

Answer: The order of the components of Part 2 is the offeror's decision.

- b. Should the Understanding be considered part of the Technical Proposal (Part 2) or is it to be included in Part 1 or Part 3?

Answer: The understanding should be included in Part 2, the Technical Proposal.

35. Question: Re the Management Plan section: Is it considered part of the Technical Proposal (Part 2) and, if not, should it be placed in Part 1 or Part 3?

Answer: The management plan should be included in Part 2, the Technical Proposal.

36. Question: Re Past Performance section: Section L.8.A. states that offerors shall submit a "list of five (5) 'relevant' contracts and subcontracts completed during the past three (3) years and all contracts and subcontracts currently in process."

- a. Does this mean that you would like us to provide:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

- i. Five (5) contracts/subcontracts completed in the last three years; or
- ii. Five (5) completed contracts/subcontracts **AND** all contracts and subcontracts in process?

Answer: Please submit a list of five (5) "relevant" contracts/subcontracts completed in the last three years.

37. Question: Is it the responsibility of the evaluator to randomly assign participants at the sentencing phase to one of the three interventions? Or, will participants already sentenced to these dispositions by the Judiciary be randomly selected from each intervention?

Answer: The evaluator will randomly assign participants at the sentencing phase.

38. Question: Please provide clarification as to whether the evaluation calls for random assignment (at the time of sentencing) or random selection (which would be done after a sentencing disposition by the court).

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 37.

39. Question: The proposed evaluation also requires a control group.
- Is one of the three randomized categories to be designated as a control?
 - Is it the responsibility of the applicant to establish a fourth control group that is not receiving YODP services?
 - What is the experimental: control ratio of the 400 participants per site?
 - Is each group intended to serve as a control to the other?

Answer: The control group will be comprised of incarcerated youth. There will not be a fourth control group. The control: experimental ratio is 200:100:100 subject to change. The aftercare and alternative sentencing groups will be compared to the incarcerated only group and to each other.

40. Question: Does the research necessitate collaboration with only the Juvenile Justice System or does it require additional collaboration with the adult system?

Answer: Collaboration will be with which ever court system the grantee has a relationship with.

41. Question: Is stratification expected at recruitment for variables (e.g. race/ethnicity, gender offense type, etc.)?

Answer: Offerors should propose what they assume to be the optimal design with a total sample estimated at 2400 youth.

42. *Question: Are there any criteria that would warrant exclusion from participation in the study?*

Answer: See refer to the answer to Question No. 15.

43. Question: .Whose staff (grantee or contractor) is responsible for interviews at baseline and follow-up? What data mentioned in C.4.4 might be collected by grantees in lieu of a baseline interview?"

Answer: The contractor is responsible for interviews at baseline and follow-up. Projects' management information systems are tracking program enrollments, youth participation in program services, and program outcomes including educational attainments (diplomas, GEDs, and other certificates), and placements in employment and post-secondary education. The contractor may develop a supplementary form for the grantees to administer.

44. Question: Do grantees have a mechanism for tracking and locating participants (including drop-outs) at follow-up?

Answer: While follow-up services is an expected component of service delivery it should not be assumed that all grantees have a mechanism for tracking and locating participants (including drop-outs) at follow-up.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

45. Question: What is the length of participant commitment to the YODP intervention?

Answer: There is no required or predetermined length of participant commitment to the YODP intervention.

46. Question: What is the length of community control/probation for participants?

Answer: The length of community control/probation for participants will vary by individual participant, court, and adjudicated circumstances.

47. Question: Will information from the round I and II outcome evaluations and round II process evaluation be made available to applicants?

Answer: No. The final report for the Round Two process evaluation has not been released. The Rounds One and Two outcomes evaluation interim report has been submitted to DOL but is not cleared for release. The final report is due in December 2005.

48. Question: The project director is required to have 5 years of experience and graduate degree; principal investigator is required to have 5 years experience but no academic level is indicated; and task leaders require 3 years of experience and graduate education. May additional years of related management experience fulfill PD degree requirements? Is the absence of preferred academic level for principal investigators an inadvertent omission?

Answer: If a proposed Project Director does not have a graduate degree, then he or she must have at least 10 years of experience managing large, multi-part social science research, programs evaluations, or demonstration projects. Yes, the absence of preferred academic level for the principal investigators was an inadvertent omission; the academic requirement is a graduate degree in a relevant area.

49. Question: Will grantees/judicial partners bear the cost of travel and per diem to project meetings?

Answer: Yes, grantees/judicial partners bear the cost of travel and per diem to the project meetings.

50. Question: Can the final report from the Round II process evaluation be made available to proposers? Can any information from the Round III evaluation be made available?

Answer: The final report for the Round Two evaluation is awaiting Departmental clearance and can not be provided to offerors. No information from the Phase Three evaluation has been cleared for release.

51. Question: To provide more information on grantee program operations, data collection procedures, and participant characteristics, can quarterly reports to DOL submitted by the six demonstration sites be made available to proposers? Are any other sources of information on program characteristics at the demonstration sites available for review?

Answer: Yes, the quarterly quantitative reports as of December 31, 2004 will be posted on the internet (Please see associated links).

52. Question: Will the grantees or the evaluator be responsible for securing agreements with court systems to implement random assignment? Is there a list of judges or courts that have already agreed to participate in random assignment?

Answer: The grantees are responsible for securing the agreements with the court systems with the assistance of the evaluation contractor. So far as we know, there are no agreements to participate in random assignment already in place.

53. Question: Are the aftercare services provided to the second random assignment group (incarceration with aftercare) offered or overseen by the YODP sites or are they services delivered separately and independently through the justice system?

Answer: Aftercare services are provided by the YODP grantees.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

54. Question: Is there an estimated start date for the project?

Answer: The grantees received their initial grants for the random assignment evaluation June 30, 2004.

55. Question: Will the project be funded for the full length of the follow-up period?

Answer: Yes, the project will be funded for the full length of the follow-up period, subject to availability of funds and satisfactory progress.

56. Question: Does the agreement from the court to assist also cover the control group? For instance, will we be able to collect, or at least verify, date of release from incarceration?

Answer: Agreements with the courts are not yet in place; the availability of data will be determined as part of a negotiation process.

57. Question: What are the average lengths of treatments and incarceration?

Answer: These data are not currently available.

58. Question: Will all commitments be controlled by the same agency? Will we be dealing with adult Departments of Corrections (or probation or parole supervision), as well as Juvenile agencies? Adult courts and Juvenile courts? Is YOPD a court placement alternative, or is such a placement the function of the correctional agency?

Answer: The commitments will be controlled by the court, which in some cases may be an adult court, but the evaluator should expect to also have some involvement with the correctional facilities. The YODP grantees are a court placement alternative.

59. Question: What is the process for establishing the "other" outcome measures provided by the government apart from earnings, employment and recidivism? Are there GPRA outcomes envisioned by the government?

Answer: The offeror should propose additional outcome measures in the Technical Approach section of their proposal. A decision to include these measures will be made during the study's design phase. There are no GPRA outcomes associated with this evaluation.

60. Question: Are telephone interviews acceptable?

Answer: Yes, telephone interviews are acceptable.

61. Question: Will the contractor work with local non-profits, one-stop centers, faith-based organizations to coordinate data collection?

Answer: Yes, if necessary the contractor will work with local non-profits, one-stop centers, and faith-based organizations to coordinate data collection.

62. Question: Can the contractor use a PowerPoint presentation instead of overhead transparencies?

Answer: Pursuant to Section L.9, each offeror shall use black and white overhead transparencies (slides) to document key points of its presentation. The Government will provide one overhead projector, one flip-chart pad, and marker pens for the offeror's use during the oral presentation. The offeror may not use or submit any other media documents. "The offeror shall submit its set of overhead transparencies and five (5) paper copies to the Government in a sealed package with its offer" (see L.7). Failure to submit the overhead transparencies and paper copies by the date established for receipt of offers will cause the offer to be rejected as non-responsive. The purpose of limiting the use of black and white overhead transparencies is to reduce the bid and proposal costs, keep focus on content, and to keep the playing field level.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

63. Question: Section L (L-9): During the oral presentation, "Offerors may not use company senior or general managers or consultants to make any part of the oral presentation." If a senior manager also holds a primary research role, can they be part of the oral presentation?

Answer: Yes. The Government is aware that in small businesses corporate officials are often the ones designated to manage the contracts. Our concern is corporate officials or others making the oral presentation that will not manage the projects or will be not part of the performance team. If a company senior manager is proposed as the Project Manager/ Director, or designated in the budget for the requirement, then yes, that person will be allowed to present at the oral presentation.

64. Question: RFP Reference: page M-4, Section M.3.D (Evaluation Factors for Award, Contractor's Capability to Perform the Contract). The RFP cross references Section L.8 (5b) through L.8 (5f) throughout. Should this reference be Section L.9, pages L-8 through L-10?

Answer: Section M.3.D cross references in error. Section L.9, not L.8 addresses the content of the oral presentation. Section M.3.D (Contractor's Capability to Perform the Contract) should read as follows:

The Government will evaluate each offeror's capability to perform the contract on the basis of its oral presentation and the responses it gives during the question and answer session that will follow the oral presentation. In making this evaluation, the government will consider an offeror's: (1) knowledge of the content of the work in terms of constituent activities, their inputs and outputs, and their interrelationships and interdependencies (See Section L.9 (5b)); (2) recognition of the appropriate sequence and realistic duration of the work activities (See Section L.9 (5c)); (3) knowledge of the appropriate types of resources required to perform the work activities (See Section L.9 (5d)); (4) familiarity with the difficulties, uncertainties, and risks associated with the work (See Section L.9 (5e)); and (5) knowledge of the personnel and subcontractor qualifications necessary to the performance of the work (See Section L.9 (5f)).

65. Question: RFP reference: page L-11, Section L.10 (A), Part 2, item (2) (Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors, Submission of Proposal, General Instructions). Item 2 indicates that the 20-page limit refers to the "technical approach factor" only. Please clarify what information is to be included in the "technical approach factor". More specifically, does the statement of the scope of work and the description of the offeror's understanding of the intent and requirements fall within the "technical approach factor" and thus the 20-page limit?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 7.

66. Question: RFP reference: page L-13, Section L.11 (Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors, Special Requirements) and page C-3, Section C.6 (Description/ Specifications/Statement of Work, Special Requirements). The allocation for Principal Investigator(s) is 30%. Will two Principal Investigators allocated at 15% each meet the requirements?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 5.

67. Question: The RFP lists Nashville and The Bronx as Round 3 YODP sites, but the list of grantees funded under SGA/DFA 01-109 does not include Nashville, and Yonkers is the closest community to The Bronx. Please clarify the sites selected for this impact study.

Answer: The Home Builders Institute of Washington, DC was awarded a grant; however, the project is physically located in Nashville. The Bronx is not Yonkers; rather, it is Wildcat Service Corporation, located in New York, NY.

68. Question: DOL/ETA is funding a process evaluation of Round 3 and an outcome evaluation of Rounds 1 and 2. What organization(s) is conducting those evaluation activities?

Answer: McNeil Research and Evaluation Associates (formerly Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc.) is the prime contractor; Mathematica Policy Research is the sub-contractor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

69. Question: The RFP indicates additional funds were provided to the six impact study communities in June 2004, and it indicated that "second-year funds also may be available for these grants." That is, grant funding may be extended to June 2006. However, neither the random assignment nor the baseline data collection steps will be finished by that time based on the schedule suggested in the RFP. This suggests that any grant-funded "treatments" will not be in operation during crucial points for many of the participants in the study because grant funding will have ended. Please clarify the relationship between the grant schedule and the schedule for this study.

Answer: We expect to give the grantees extensions as necessary, assuming availability of funds and satisfactory progress.

70. Question: The RFP indicates additional funds were provided to the six impact study communities in June 2004, and it indicated that "second-year funds also may be available for these grants." That is, grant funding may be extended to June 2006. However, neither the random assignment nor the baseline data collection steps will be finished by that time based on the schedule suggested in the RFP. This suggests that any grant-funded "treatments" will not be in operation during crucial points for many of the participants in the study because grant funding will have ended. Please clarify the relationship between the grant schedule and the schedule for this study.

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 69.

71. Question: We believe the solicitation listed below requires that applicants have revenue of less than \$6m per year. A private firm proposes to subcontract with an entity that has less than \$6m of revenue per year, but it is a part a University which has much higher revenue. The award would be managed by and paid to the University on behalf of the entity. Would the entity be eligible to participate in this competition?

Answer: This is a 100% Small Business Set-Aside for profit making businesses.

72. Question: Section L.9.4 (page L-8) discussed the oral presentation and the number of people who can be present. Additionally it states that "the project director who will have a 100 % time operational responsibility for contract performance..." However, page C-3 stated that the Project Director's required time commitment as 40%." Should the project director be listed as 40% or 100%?

Answer: Section L.9.4 should read as follows:

4. Offeror's presentation team: A maximum of five contractor personnel (prime and subcontractor) may participate. These individuals/presenters will attend the oral presentation and the question and answer session and shall answer questions directed to them. The presentation shall be made by one or more of the personnel whom the offeror will employ to manage or supervise contract performance on a full time basis or as designated in Sections C.6 and L.11. The Project Director who will have a 40% time operational responsibility for contract performance shall be present and shall, at a minimum, answer questions directed to him/her during the question and answer session.

Offerors may not use company senior or general managers or consultants to make any part of the oral presentation. In addition to the maximum of five individuals who will participate, the offeror may send two non-participating representatives to observe. Hence a total of seven contractor personnel will be permitted to attend (only five may participate) the presentation. No other officers, employees, consultants, agents, or other representatives of the offeror may attend.

73. Question: We wanted our Director of Evaluation to be the PD because she has 15 years of experience. However, section L.9.4 (page L-8) states that senior officials of the company cannot participate in the presentation. This is a severe handicap for our company given that we would want our employee to be the PD and not a consultant. Is it a requirement that the PD participate in the presentation? Additionally, can a senior official of the company serve as a PD on this project?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 63.

74. Question: Page H-9 (Section H.26) presents the term "cognizant agency." Please explain this term. It is used in a discussion about where proposals for indirect cost rates and supporting data and documentation should be sent.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Answer: Cognizant agency means the Federal agency responsible for negotiating and approving indirect cost rates for a contractor on behalf of all Federal agencies.

75. Question: Page L-7 (*Note* in Section L.8). I could not locate a form referenced in Attachment J-7 – Past Performance Reference Information. Please advise as to where I could find it.

Answer: Forms referenced in Section J of the solicitation may be downloaded at: <http://www.doleta.gov/sga/rfpforms.cfm>.

76. Question: Page L-12 (Section L.10, Part 2) states "Proposals specifying less than one hundred twenty (120) days Government Acceptance may be considered not acceptable." We are not clear what this means. Please explain.

Answer: Pursuant to Section L.10, "Proposals specifying less than one hundred twenty (120) days Government Acceptance may be considered not acceptable," means that the proposal's methods and costs must be good for at least 120 days.

77. Question: Page L-13 (Section L.10, Part 3, C.2) states that we should submit "a total cost breakdown utilizing the enclosed cost and price analysis form." We could not locate the form.

Answer: Forms referenced in Section J of the solicitation may be downloaded at: <http://www.doleta.gov/sga/rfpforms.cfm>.

78. Question: Page L-13 (Section L.10, Part 3, C.2.a.) indicates that we should "include backup data to support the type of labor and estimated numbers of hours within each category." What is considered as backup data?

Answer: The backup data required is a breakout of each labor position and the number of hours for each person.

79. Question: In the numbered notes of the above referenced solicitation, it says that this is 100% set aside for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Minority Institutions (MIs).

Answer: This is a 100% small business set-aside for profit making companies and not a 100% set-aside for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Institutions.

80. Question: Impact Evaluation of the Youth Offender Demonstration Project. Does the Small Business Entity have to be a registered contractor with the Department of Labor, or is it sufficient to provide the organization's financial records as proof of its annual revenue in order to be eligible to apply as the lead for this project?

Answer: Pursuant to Section L.10, all offerors are required to submit Section K of the solicitation, in which they self-certify that the offeror is a small business under the NAICS code 541611.

81. Question: Are exhibits to be included in the 20 pages or can they be attached?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 7.

82. Question: Does the management plan have to be included in the 20 pages or can it be attached?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to Question No. 7.

83. Question: We are considering partnering with a large local University, but need to understand how the \$6M threshold applies to a University.

Answer: This is a 100% Small Business Set-aside for profit making businesses. The \$6 million threshold applies to the prime contractor. Be advised that the prime contractor must perform at least 50 percent of the work pursuant to FAR 52.219-14 Limitations on Subcontracting.