

Ventura County Owner-Occupied Mitigation Program

Request for Proposals - Questions and Answers

DRAFT FOR COUNTY REVIEW

Request for Proposals (RFP) Release Date: August 11, 2026 | Written Questions Deadline: August 25, 2026

Question 1. Under Section 2. 'Purpose and Description of Services' of the RFP, Outreach and Marketing, Application Intake, and Application Processing are items under Category 2 rather than Category 1 as included under the Contractor definition - Can the County please confirm which category they would like these services to be detailed under within the proposal?

County Response: The County acknowledges the inconsistency in the RFP. For purposes of proposal preparation and evaluation, Outreach and Marketing, Application Intake, and applicant-facing Application Processing should be included under Category 2, consistent with Section 2, "Purpose and Description of Services." Category 2 is intended to provide the local, in-person implementation of the Program, including outreach, applicant assistance, document collection, intake, inspections, environmental coordination, and other field-based activities.

Category 1 is intended to perform the administrative review and compliance functions that may generally be completed remotely, including formal eligibility determination, Duplication of Benefits review, award determination, QA/QC, reporting, compliance, and program closeout. Any language in the Contractor definition or elsewhere in the RFP that suggests Outreach and Marketing or Application Intake are Category 1 responsibilities should be read consistently with the Category 2 scope described in Section 2.

Because the Program requires close coordination between applicant-facing activities and administrative review, the Category 1 and Category 2 Contractors will be expected to collaborate continuously. Specific workflows, handoffs, documentation requirements, and responsibilities between the categories will be further defined through the Program's Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-14, 19-21, 31-32.

Question 2. Was the Tier I Environmental Assessment completed, if so, what environmental mitigation efforts will be required?

County Response: HCD has conducted the Tier 1 assessment and a Tier II checklist has been drafted. Site-specific environmental requirements will be determined through the Tier II environmental review for each participating property. Specific mitigation measures cannot be identified in advance and will depend on the conditions and proposed work at each property. Link to Tier 1 assessment: [Environmental Document Download Tool | California Department of Housing and Community Development](#)

Sources: Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 15-16; OOM RFP, pp. 9-10, 18.

Question 3. Does the County have or plan to develop and provide a System of Record? If so, please elaborate the County's anticipated System of Record platform and expected operational date.

County Response: The County is revising the approach described in the RFP regarding the Program Management System and System of Record. Although the RFP originally stated that the County would provide the System of Record and program application used to process applicants and manage awarded projects, the selected contractor will be responsible for providing the system(s) necessary for program implementation.

For purposes of clarification, the "System of Record" is the repository for official program data, documentation, compliance records, reporting, and record retention. The "Program Management System" is the operational platform used to administer day-to-day program activities, including applicant intake and processing, eligibility review, project tracking, document management, and management of awarded projects.

The selected contractor will work with County staff to identify the proposed System of Record and Program Management System and obtain County approval prior to implementation. The contractor-provided system(s) must

meet County requirements for program administration, documentation, compliance, reporting, security, and record retention.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 8-9, 34-35; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit G.

Question 4. Please describe the contractor’s responsibilities for business requirements development, workflow design, configuration, interfaces, data fields, testing, training, reporting, data migration, ongoing system support, and interim operations before the County’s system of record becomes operational.

County Response: The County is revising the approach described in the RFP. The selected Contractor will be responsible for providing, configuring, implementing, maintaining, and supporting the Program Management System, which will serve as the Program’s System of Record and support applicant intake, application processing, project management, document management, reporting, and closeout.

Proposers should describe their proposed system, including the approach to system configuration, workflow development, testing, training, reporting, data security and protection of PII, user access, ongoing technical support, and any required integrations or interfaces. The County is open to collaborating with the selected Contractor on system design and configuration to ensure the system supports approved Program requirements and workflows.

The Program’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) will also be developed collaboratively by the County and the selected Category 1 and Category 2 Contractors. This collaborative process is intended to clearly define roles, responsibilities, handoffs, documentation requirements, and system workflows between the two categories and to minimize duplication of effort during Program implementation.

All costs associated with providing and supporting the proposed Program Management System, including required software, licenses, configuration, implementation, maintenance, and support, should be identified in the proposal. This clarification supersedes the RFP language indicating that the County will provide the Program Management System.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 20-21, 34-35; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit G.

Question 5. Please confirm that a firm that does not hold a CSLB contractor license can serve as a Category 2 prime contractor if they include a properly licensed California General Contractor as a subcontractor.

County Response: Category 2 allows a team approach using subcontractors, consultants, engineers, environmental specialists, and licensed contractors; however, the prime Contractor remains fully responsible for all Category 2 deliverables and contract requirements. The HCD Draft Standard Agreement requires procurement of a duly licensed and insured Program Operator and/or Construction Manager, and personnel performing or running construction work must hold the applicable California State Licensing Board (CSLB) Class B or Class C license. Accordingly, a proposer that does not itself hold a CSLB contractor license must demonstrate that its proposed team structure satisfies all applicable licensing requirements and that all construction work will be performed and supervised by properly licensed entities and personnel.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-11, 18-19, 28-31; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 2-8.

Question 6. Please confirm that the entity holding the CSLB contractor license will assume responsibility for construction execution, insurance, bonding, warranties, and licensed trade work.

County Response: Yes. The RFP defines the General Contractor as the licensed entity responsible and liable for construction execution, whether work is performed directly or through subcontractors. The General Contractor is also responsible for construction-related insurance, bonding, warranties/guarantees, construction oversight, reporting, and management, subject to the prime Contractor’s overall responsibility for the awarded Category 2 contract.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 6-7, 18-19.

Question 7. The RFP requires proposers to provide a total cost for each category and states that cost proposals will be evaluated using the lowest-cost formula. However, the RFP also allows multiple awards within a category and states that the County does not guarantee quantities. Please clarify: (1) whether proposers should base pricing on specific estimated quantities or workloads, and if so, provide those assumptions; (2) whether cost

evaluations will be based on unit pricing, total proposed pricing, or another methodology; and (3) how work will be allocated if multiple contractors are awarded within the same category.

County Response: (1) The County does not guarantee a minimum quantity of work. Proposers should provide the unit costs, category total, and all other cost components required by Section 5.H and Attachment 3 without assuming a guaranteed volume of work.

(2) Cost scoring will be based on the cost proposal submitted for the applicable category using the formula in Section 5.M. Proposers must provide both the required unit pricing and total cost information. If a proposal excludes a component of a category, the County will evaluate the costs for the components proposed, while also considering the proposer's ability to perform or manage the full scope of work required for that category. Proposals will not be disadvantaged solely because their total proposed cost is higher where that difference results from including components of work omitted by another proposer.

(3) If multiple contractors are awarded within the same category, the County will allocate work based on Program needs and may consider factors such as contractor capacity, performance, availability, geographic or service needs, and other contract-management considerations. No minimum allocation of work is guaranteed.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 4, 10-12, 33-34, 40-41, 48-49.

Question 8. Please confirm that the "Description of Services" column in Attachment 3 pricing for each category should match the "Description of Services" breakout under Section 2. Purpose and Description of Services.

County Response: Yes. The Description of Services in the Cost Proposal should correspond to the services required for the category under Section 2. Proposers may provide additional line-item detail as needed, but the cost proposal must address all required services for the category proposed.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-22, 48-49.

Question 9. Please confirm that Category 4 is optional relocation for homeowners and does not adhere to URA.

County Response: Category 4 relocation services are to be provided when required by the Program and are subject to applicable federal relocation requirements. The RFP expressly identifies Category 4 as relocation services to be performed in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (URA), as amended and HCD's Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Assistance Plan. Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 may also apply.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 6, 11, 22; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit E, Special Terms and Conditions.

Question 10. Does the County expect that the construction cost is equal to the Xactimate determined amount? If so, can the county specify the pricelist and variables being used?

County Response: The Estimate Cost of Repair (ECR) is the Program's basis for estimating reasonable construction costs and Contractors must use a HUD-approved construction cost-estimating tool, such as Xactimate, with unit- and quantity-based costs reflective of the region served. The RFP does not identify a specific Xactimate price list or variables for proposal purposes. Applicable estimating parameters will be established during Program implementation in accordance with HCD requirements and County-approved procedures. The ECR is an estimate used to establish the approved scope and cost; actual construction payment remains subject to the approved contract, scope, cost reasonableness, and Program requirements.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 6, 18, 33; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 15-16.

Question 11. Will the County provide the required applicant/County/contractor construction agreement form, and is the Category 2 prime or the licensed General Contractor expected to execute that agreement with the Applicant and County?

County Response: The construction agreement form may be provided by the County or proposed by the licensed General Contractor, subject to County review and approval prior to use.

The Category 2 Contractor will be responsible for coordinating completion and execution of the agreement among the Applicant, County, and applicable contractor(s). The licensed General Contractor performing the construction work is expected to execute the agreement for the construction-related responsibilities assigned to the General Contractor.

If the Category 2 Contractor is also the licensed General Contractor performing the work, the Category 2 Contractor may execute the agreement in that capacity.

Sources: OOM RFP, p. 18; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 6-8.

Question 12. Please identify whether bonding will apply to the overall Category 2 contract, each property-specific construction agreement, or another amount established by the County.

County Response: The RFP establishes that the General Contractor is responsible for applicable construction-related bonding. The solicitation does not establish a single blanket bond amount or specify that bonding will be calculated solely against the overall Category 2 contract. Final bonding requirements will be established in the executed agreement and may be tied to property-specific construction work or other applicable contract values, consistent with federal, state, County, and Program requirements.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 6-7, 56-66; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit D.

Question 13. Please confirm that the required experience for Category 2 references must demonstrate two consecutive years of satisfactory experience related to fire and flood mitigation (page 33), not two consecutive years of experience implementing and operating a CDBG-DR homeowner assistance program (page 40).

County Response: For purposes of this solicitation, the County clarifies that the Customer Satisfaction reference requirement will be evaluated based on experience relevant to the Category proposed.

For **Category 1**, the County is seeking at least two consecutive years of satisfactory experience within the last five years implementing and/or operating federally assisted programs similar in scope or complexity to the OOM Program, including programs involving homeowner assistance, eligibility and compliance review, federal grant requirements, reporting, and related program administration.

For **Category 2**, relevant experience may include fire and flood mitigation, CDBG-DR homeowner assistance, construction management or other comparable work consistent with the Category 2 scope.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 33 and 40.

Question 14. Please describe the anticipated invoicing and payment process for Category 2, including invoice frequency, review and approval timelines, payment terms, documentation requirements, treatment of mobilization and stored materials, and whether progress payments may be invoiced before completion of the entire property-specific scope.

County Response: The awarded Contractor will invoice the County in accordance with the final contract and Exhibit B. Because the OOM Program is reimbursement-based, the County will review Contractor invoices and supporting documentation and then submit eligible costs to HCD through its reimbursement process. HCD will reimburse the County for approved eligible expenditures.

Progress payments may be invoiced for documented and satisfactorily completed portions of an approved property-specific scope of work; completion of the entire property scope is not required before an invoice may be submitted. Because the Program is reimbursement-based, invoices must identify and substantiate the eligible work completed during the billing period. Payment will not be made in advance for work that has not been completed.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 33-34, 56-58; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit B, pp. 1-6.

Question 15. Please identify the County's anticipated review and approval timeframe for Category 2 change-order requests. Will the contractor receive appropriate cost and schedule adjustments for concealed conditions, code-required work, hazardous-material discoveries, homeowner-caused delays, permitting delays, or other conditions outside the contractor's control?

County Response: The RFP requires Category 2 to prepare change-order requests for County approval supported by a Cost Reasonableness Analysis. The RFP does not establish a fixed review period or automatic entitlement to cost or schedule adjustments. Contractors must promptly document and submit changed conditions to the County. Any cost or schedule adjustment must be approved in writing by the County and must be eligible, reasonable, and consistent with Program requirements before the changed work is performed, except where immediate action is necessary to protect health or safety and is subsequently documented as directed by the County.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 18-19, 61; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibits A-B.

Question 16. Will the County and Category 1 Contractor be responsible for securing executed right-of-entry documents, homeowner availability, and readiness to proceed before Category 2 mobilization? Please clarify how homeowner-caused delays, denied access, cancellations, scope refusals, or occupied-site safety concerns will affect scheduling, payment, and performance requirements.

County Response: The County and Category 1 Contractor will coordinate eligibility and award-related readiness, while Category 2 is responsible for direct coordination with Applicants for inspections and construction activities, including scheduling and maintaining approved work orders authorizing access. Category 2 should not mobilize to perform property work without required approvals and authorization from County and HCD. Homeowner-caused delays, denied access, cancellations, scope refusals, or safety concerns must be documented and promptly reported to the County. Such events will be addressed case-by-case through the approved work plan, contract, and Program procedures; the RFP does not provide automatic payment for work not performed.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 18-19, 31-33; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 7-8, 15-16.

Question 17. Please confirm that Section 9. Insurance Provisions includes the entirety of insurance requirements.

County Response: Section 9 contains the sample County contract's standard insurance provisions, but it expressly states that the requirements may be amended as needed and refers to the Insurance Matrix for additional details. Final insurance requirements will be included in or incorporated into the executed agreement and may vary based on the awarded scope.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 59-60 and sample contract.

Question 18. The RFP states that unit rates remain in effect during the contract term. Please clarify whether property-specific construction costs developed through approved ECRs will use Xactimate pricing current at inspection, scope approval, or construction authorization, and whether adjustments will be permitted for material escalation, prevailing-wage changes, code changes, tariffs, or other market conditions outside the contractor's control.

County Response: Property-specific construction costs will be established through the approved ECR and associated scope of work. Unless otherwise directed by the County, the ECR should use the applicable Xactimate pricing in effect at the time the ECR is prepared and submitted for County approval.

If the contractor determines that required work cannot reasonably be performed at the applicable Xactimate pricing, the contractor may obtain competitive bids or quotes to substantiate the actual market cost. Any proposed cost exceeding Xactimate pricing must be supported by appropriate documentation and is subject to County review and written approval.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 11-12, 18, 33-34, 48-49; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, p. 15.

Question 19. Section 5.H indicates that compensation will be based on unit pricing and per-unit completed services, while Section 5.H.3 requires invoices for staff costs to include detailed timesheets. Please clarify whether proposers should submit: (a) fixed unit pricing only; (b) labor categories and hourly rates with timesheet-supported billing; or (c) a hybrid approach. If a hybrid approach is intended, please clarify how payment will be determined.

County Response: A hybrid approach is intended. Proposers must provide the unit pricing and total cost information required by Attachment 3 and Section 5.H. Where the proposer includes staff-cost or hourly-rate components, the proposer should identify the applicable labor categories and rates. Unit-priced deliverables will be paid at the approved unit price upon completion, while approved staff-cost items will be supported by detailed timesheets clearly showing time being billed towards the program,. All labor categories, unit fees, and other direct costs are subject to County approval and will be reflected in the final contract Exhibit B.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 33-34, 48-49.

Question 20. Attachment 9 and other portions of the RFP reference or incorporate by reference multiple contract documents that are not included in the solicitation package, including but not limited to the State of California General Terms and Conditions (GTC), the Ventura County Non-Employee Information Technology Usage Policy, the Insurance Matrix, the Data Sharing Agreement, and other HCD, HUD, or CDBG-DR requirements. Please provide all documents, exhibits, policies, terms and conditions, and incorporated references that may apply to the resulting contract but are not currently included in the RFP package.

County Response: The County will make available the contract documents and policies that are required for proposal preparation or that materially affect proposer obligations. The HCD Draft Standard Agreement, including Exhibit G Data Sharing and Usage Protocols, is a controlling reference document. Other HCD/HUD/CDBG-DR requirements identified by reference remain applicable as provided in the Draft Standard Agreement. County operational policies, insurance requirements, and IT/data-security requirements applicable to the final scope will be provided or incorporated into the final contract. If any newly provided document materially changes proposal requirements, the County will issue an addendum as appropriate.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 56-69; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibits C, D, E, G.

Question 21. The RFP references and incorporates by reference several documents that are not included in the solicitation package, including the State of California General Terms and Conditions (GTC), the Ventura County Non-Employee IT Usage Policy, and the Data Sharing Agreement. Because proposers have not had an opportunity to review these documents, will the County provide the missing documents and allow a subsequent Q&A period so proposers may submit questions related to those materials prior to proposal submission?

County Response: The County will provide or identify any additional documents determined necessary for proposal preparation. The County does not intend to reopen the Q&A period solely for documents that govern post-award implementation and do not materially change proposal requirements. If additional information materially changes the solicitation, the County may issue an addendum and adjust the schedule, including allowing additional questions if warranted.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 1, 56-69; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibits C, D, E, G.

Question 22. The proposal amount and project timeline are listed under item 2 under B. Proposal Content and as separate items under Part Two of the Submission Checklist. Please confirm that bidders should adhere to the submission structure under Attachment 1 if the guidance under B. Proposal Content and Attachment 1 Proposal Checklist are conflicting.

County Response: The County acknowledges the difference in organization between Section 5.B and Attachment 1. Proposers may follow the structure in Attachment 1. The Project Timeline may be included with the Work Plan and Work Schedule, and the Proposal Amount should be included in the Cost Proposal. Proposers are not required to duplicate this information in a separate "Proposal Amount and Project Timeline" section, provided all information required by Section 5 is included.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 25-36, 44-45.

Question 23. The Cost Proposal form states, "Definitions of Per Unit Costs, see Definitions"; however, the Definitions section does not define this term.

County Response: The reference to a separate definition of "Per Unit Costs" is inadvertent. For purposes of Attachment 3, a unit cost means the proposer's all-inclusive proposed cost for completing the identified unit of service or deliverable. Unit costs should include all anticipated costs required to perform that unit, except separately identified reimbursable items such as permitting where the Cost Proposal expressly states otherwise.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 33-34, 48-49.

Question 24. Please confirm that proposers are not required to provide pricing for mitigation elements and this will be provided and negotiating once awarded.

County Response: Attachment 3 requires Category 2 proposers to include anticipated costs for fire and flood mitigation in accordance with the Levels of Importance. Proposers should provide the pricing information requested by the Cost Proposal for the Category 2 scope. Property-specific construction costs will later be established through

inspections, ECRs, approved scopes of work, and cost-reasonableness review, but the proposal must still include the required mitigation pricing basis.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 18, 33-34, 48-49.

Question 25. To ensure proposers have sufficient time to evaluate clarifications, adjust teaming arrangements, and incorporate responses into pricing and technical approaches, will the County consider releasing responses to questions no later than ten (10) calendar days before the proposal submission deadline

County Response: The County intends to issue responses to proposer questions as promptly as practicable. The County is not committing to a minimum ten-calendar-day period between issuance of responses and the proposal deadline. If the County determines that the responses or any addendum materially affect scope, pricing, or proposal requirements, the County may extend the proposal deadline by written addendum.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 1, 25-26.

Question 26. Has the County received information regarding the availability of advance funding for this project? The need to front project costs may present a significant financial challenge for some organizations.

County Response: The County does not anticipate providing advance funding to contractors. The HCD Draft Standard Agreement provides funding to the County on a reimbursement basis, and the County's contractor payments must be supported by eligible, authorized, and documented costs under the executed County contract. Proposers should demonstrate sufficient financial capacity to carry out the proposed scope pending reimbursement in accordance with contract payment terms.

Sources: Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 1-2; Exhibit B, pp. 3-4; OOM RFP, pp. 28-29, 33-34.

Question 27. Would the Ventura County Fire Department (VCFD) be eligible to serve as the lead applicant or contractor for this RFP, with another organization participating as a subcontractor or project management partner?

County Response: The RFP defines a Proposer/Bidder as any organization submitting a proposal and does not expressly exclude a public agency. Any entity serving as prime proposer must be legally authorized to contract for the proposed services and must satisfy the applicable RFP requirements, including responsibility for the full awarded scope, federal procurement/compliance requirements, staffing, financial capacity, and applicable licensing. If a public agency submits a proposal, requirements that are not legally applicable to that type of entity should be identified and explained in the proposal with equivalent documentation of legal authority and organizational status. The County may request clarification during evaluation.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 8-10, 24-36, 44-45.

Question 28. Initial Home Inspection Personnel Requirements: Are there any specific licenses, professional certifications, training requirements, or minimum years of experience required for personnel performing the Initial Home Inspections and mitigation assessments under Category 2?

County Response: The RFP does not establish a specific Program-created license, certification, or minimum number of years of experience solely for Initial Home Inspection personnel. The Initial Home Inspection is described as a noninvasive visual examination. Proposers must provide qualified personnel with the education, training, technical experience, and any licenses or certifications required by applicable law for the tasks they perform. Personnel performing construction or licensed trade work must hold the appropriate licenses.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 7, 14-18, 28-31; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 2-8.

Question 29. Tier II Environmental Review Personnel Requirements: Are there any specific professional licenses, certifications, training, educational qualifications, or minimum experience requirements for personnel preparing and completing the Tier II Environmental Reviews under Category 2?

County Response: The RFP does not prescribe one specific license, certification, degree, or minimum number of years of experience for all Tier II Environmental Review personnel. Proposers must assign qualified environmental staff who demonstrate knowledge and experience sufficient to complete site-specific reviews under 24 CFR Part 58 and other

applicable HCD/HUD requirements. Where a particular environmental review topic requires a licensed or certified professional under federal, state, or local law, the applicable credential is required for that task.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 9-10, 18, 28-31; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 15-16.

Question 30. Category 2 Scope: May a proposer submit a Category 2 proposal limited to specific mitigation construction activities identified in the Levels of Importance, or must a Category 2 proposer provide or manage the full Category 2 scope of services, either directly or through subcontractors/consultants?

County Response: A Category 2 proposer must provide or manage the full Category 2 scope of services. The RFP states that Category 2 shall provide all services necessary for environmental review, pre-construction, construction management, and mitigation implementation, and it permits use of subcontractors, consultants, engineers, environmental specialists, and licensed contractors as part of a team. The proposal may not be limited only to selected mitigation construction activities.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-11, 35-36.

Question 31. Can the County please specify the total project budget?

County Response: The total HCD award to Ventura County is \$5,396,147, which will support overall Program costs, including the four Categories included in this RFP and partial recovery of County staff time. Proposers should develop their cost proposals based on their independent assessment of the staffing, resources, services, and other costs reasonably necessary to successfully perform the full scope of work for each Category proposed. Cost proposals should reflect the Proposer's most accurate estimate of the actual cost to perform the work, rather than an assumed share of the overall Program budget.

Sources: Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit B, pp. 1-2; OOM RFP, pp. 4, 10-12.

Question 32. Category 2 tasks include "contractor procurement and management" - will Ventura County hold the contracts with construction vendors or do you expect those to be held by the prime contractor from this procurement?

County Response: The County expects the Category 2 prime Contractor to procure, contract with, and manage the construction vendors needed to perform the Category 2 scope, subject to County review and approval and applicable federal procurement requirements. The RFP requires Category 2 to enter into contracts with vendors required to operate the program and to provide those contracts to the County for approval. The Category 2 prime remains responsible for all subcontractors and vendors.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-11, 18-22.

Question 33. Item g states "Enter into a written agreement with selected Applicants and County for the construction and mitigation work supported by the SOW." What type of agreement is anticipated? Would the county consider entering into the agreement directly with the applicant?

County Response: The RFP anticipates a property-specific written construction/mitigation agreement involving the selected Applicant, the County, and the Category 2 Contractor. The County will provide or approve the agreement form before use. The County does not presently intend to replace this requirement with a County-Applicant-only agreement because the RFP expressly assigns the Category 2 Contractor responsibility to enter into the written agreement for the approved construction and mitigation work.

Sources: OOM RFP, p. 18; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A, pp. 6-8.

Question 34. Will the Program Administration Services category operate with independent oversight over the Environmental, Design, Construction Management, and Mitigation Services category?

County Response: Category 1 and Category 2 are separate scopes with distinct responsibilities, but Category 1 is not intended to serve as the contractual supervisor of Category 2. The County retains oversight of all awarded contractors. Category 1 performs eligibility, DOB, award, QA/QC, reporting, and compliance functions; Category 2 performs environmental, design, construction management, and mitigation functions. The contractors must coordinate handoffs and information, while County/HCD approvals remain controlling.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-22, 31-35; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit A.

Question 35. Given that Category 1 is responsible for Application Processing and Category 2 includes Outreach and Marketing, Communications, and Application Intake, will Ventura County consider consolidating these functions under Category 1 to reduce duplication of effort and improve the participant experience?

County Response: Because the Program requires close coordination between applicant-facing activities and administrative review, the Category 1 and Category 2 Contractors will be expected to collaborate continuously. Specific workflows, handoffs, documentation requirements, and responsibilities between the categories will be further defined through the Program's Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-14, 19-21, 31-32.

Question 36. Will Ventura County require the application intake and processing system to serve as both the system of record and the participant-facing user interface?

County Response: The County acknowledges that the RFP initially stated that the Program Management System would be provided by the County. The County is revising that approach. The selected Contractor will be responsible for providing, configuring, implementing, maintaining, and supporting the Program Management System, which will serve as the Program's System of Record and support application intake, processing, project tracking, document management, reporting, and closeout.

The County expects the system to include participant-facing functionality sufficient to support the application process, including secure submission of information and documents. The final system configuration, user roles, workflows, and interfaces will be developed collaboratively with the County and the selected Category 1 and Category 2 Contractors and reflected in the Program SOPs to support clear handoffs and minimize duplication of effort.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 8-9, 20-21, 34-35.

Question 37. If a single vendor is awarded multiple or all categories, how does Ventura County intend to mitigate potential conflicts of interest related to award determinations, preparation of estimated repair costs, and performance of Wildfire and Flood Mitigation work?

County Response: The RFP permits a single proposer to be awarded multiple categories. If that occurs, the County will require separation of duties, documented internal controls, and County/HCD review and approval at key decision points so that no contractor independently approves its own eligibility determination, award, ECR, scope, change order, or construction payment. The final contract and Program SOPs will establish the required controls. All contractors are also subject to the conflict-of-interest provisions in the sample County contract and applicable CDBG-DR requirements.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 10-12, 56-61; Draft Standard Agreement, Exhibit D, Conflict of Interest provisions.

Question 38. Please clarify the commercial and resourcing assumptions for the work. Specifically, which costs qualify as ODCs; whether rates may escalate during the term or extensions; and what staffing levels, monthly capacity, onsite availability, facilities, response times, surge capacity, and shared-resource arrangements proposers should assume.

County Response: other direct costs may include items such as postage, copying/mailings/notifications, computer equipment and peripherals, outreach/public-event facilities, notary services, and other County-approved direct costs. other direct cost purchases or leases require prior County approval. Proposal unit rates remain in effect for the contract term, and optional extensions are at the same submitted rates; the RFP does not provide automatic escalation. The County has not prescribed fixed staffing levels. Proposers must propose staffing, FTE commitment, on-site availability, monthly capacity, surge/scaling capability, facilities, and any shared-resource arrangements sufficient to meet the scope and required timelines. Category 2 must support regular in-person intake events and accessible service. Specific response times stated in the RFP remain applicable.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 20-21, 29-34, 48-49.

Question 39. Shall the Proposer include hourly rates in the Cost Proposal and, if so, provide the applicable hourly rates for all proposed personnel classifications or labor categories?

County Response: Yes, where the proposer anticipates billing staff costs or hourly labor, the Cost Proposal should identify the applicable labor categories and hourly rates in addition to the required unit pricing. Section 5.H requires all labor categories, fees per home finished, and other direct costs to be identified and provides that staff-cost invoices must be supported by detailed timesheets. The Cost Proposal may be edited or replaced with the proposer's template so long as all required cost categories are included.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 33-34, 48-49.

Question 40. Please confirm the required order of proposal responses is as follows

- a. Cover Letter of Interest**
- b. Proposal Amount and Project Timeline**
- c. Required Forms and Documentation**
- d. Past Performance and Record of Successful Completion of Similar Work**
- e. Proposer Description, Capacity, Qualifications and Relevant Experience**
- f. Qualified Staff Resumes and Availability**
- g. Work Plan and Work Schedule**
- h. Approach and Methodology**
- i. Customer Satisfaction Rating**
- j. Budget and Proposal**

County Response: Yes. Proposers may follow the order shown above, which aligns with the substantive sections of Section 5. Proposers must also include all documents identified in Attachment 1, Proposal Checklist. The County requests a table of contents and tabs or dividers so each required section and form is clearly identifiable.

Sources: OOM RFP, pp. 25-36, 44-45.