

**ADDENDUM TO
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**Solar for All Program Impact Reporting and
Minimum Household Savings Services RFP**

POSTED DATE: May 12, 2025
NO. 04

ADDENDUM

Proposal Due Date: Friday July 11, 2025, at 11:59 PM ET

To All Potential Proposers:

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (**RFP**) is to seek an experienced firm to be responsible for Program impact reporting, including developing and applying methodologies for achieving a minimum household savings of 20% for Program beneficiaries.

This Addendum to RFP Documents (the **Addendum**) modifies the RFP only to the extent indicated herein. Except as specifically set forth in this Addendum, all other terms set forth in the RFP remain unchanged and in full force and effect. This Addendum is hereby incorporated into and made an integral part of the RFP, and Respondents shall incorporate this Addendum into the Proposals as if it were issued in the original RFP. Per the RFP, the Respondents must acknowledge receipt of any and all Addenda, listing each Addendum by number (s) and date (s) in their Proposals on Form 3: Acknowledgement of Addenda. All capitalized terms used herein without definition shall have the terms given to them in the RFP.

Questions and Answers:

1. For training materials, will respondents be responsible for hosting the training materials?
 - Generally, Inclusive Prosperity Capital, Inc. (**IPC**) and other Community Power Coalition (**CPC**) members will host all materials developed under this RFP, including any training materials. For the selected respondent, for example, this could take the form of serving as a panelist for an IPC-hosted webinar and/or preparing written training materials posted to [IPC's Solar for All Resources page](#)."
2. Will the training be virtual, in-person, or asynchronous?
 - In general, the training occurring under this RFP will be either virtual (synchronous and asynchronous) or written, but it is possible that it may take other forms.
3. What is the length of time for each training course to be offered?
 - These details may vary depending on the specific scope of work and implementation priorities identified during contract negotiation.
4. Regarding Interviews or Presentations: Would respondents receive questions or requests for clarification on specific areas of our proposal ahead of the presentation?
 - Interviews, if conducted, may include a mix of follow-up questions and scenario-based discussions. While we may provide a list of focus areas or topics in advance, we cannot guarantee that specific questions will be shared prior to the interview. Respondents are encouraged to be prepared to discuss their proposal, approach, and capacity in greater detail during the interview process.

5. Regarding "f) Sample-auditing of household savings for Program beneficiaries": Will the number of households to be audited be agreed upon in the work orders?
 - Yes. The number of households to be audited will be agreed upon in the contracting process that results from this RFP.
6. Given that this is for a single award and not an MSA, is the language that "the IPC may, "from time to time," issue requests to the firms awarded under this prequalification RFP" included erroneously?
 - Yes, Impact Reporting and Minimum Household Savings RFP Addendum #2 deleted this provision from the RFP.
7. Does the "Commitment to community engagement and equitable and meaningful impact" section refer to how the vendor engages community or how the vendor can enable IPC to engage community?
 - This section refers to the respondent's commitment to community engagement and equitable and meaningful impact. It will be evaluated based on a variety of factors, including track record of working with low-income communities. Examples to demonstrate this could include past projects or programs in these communities, the dollar amount of projects supported in these communities, experience working with and engaging low-income communities or engaging through partnerships or community-based organizations. The Evaluation Criteria for Financing Applications outlined in Section 5 of IPC's [Financing Products Program Guidance](#) (see page 24-25) may be instructive.
8. Appendix 1 is labeled "Federal Contract Provisions" rather than "Doing Business Form." Does this need to be changed before inclusion in the response?
 - Yes, Impact Reporting and Minimum Household Savings RFP Addendum #2 has updated the appendices.
9. Please confirm that a response of 8 to 10 pages is appropriate for the "Technical Approach and Scope Alignment" section
 - There are no page limits or recommended lengths associated with the respective sections or the overall proposal submission. Respondents are encouraged to be clear, concise, and focused in their proposals to ensure efficient and effective evaluation by the review team.
10. Is the contract for a 4-year PoP or 1 base with 3 option years?
 - The contract is structured as one base year with three option years, which are subject to annual review, performance metrics, and continued funding availability. The exercise of option years will be at the sole discretion of the awarding entity.
11. Vendors have been asked to demonstrate cost effectiveness; should the cost proposal be provided in this section of the technical proposal or should vendors submit the cost proposal, along with demonstrating cost effectiveness to IPC, as a separate volume?
 - Vendors should submit the cost proposal as a separate document or volume from the technical proposal. While the "Cost Effectiveness" section of the technical proposal should describe your overall pricing strategy, value for money, and alignment with IPC's goals, the detailed cost proposal (e.g., labor rates, hours, budget breakdown) should be submitted separately to allow for an objective and independent evaluation process.
12. Is the 11:59 due time AM or PM?

- The proposal deadline is Friday, July 11, 2025, at 11:59 PM ET.

13. This is a multistate initiative, and many targeted recipients are also eligible to apply for state-level SFA programs. Can beneficiaries receive household savings from multiple programs? If so, how will the 20% household saving threshold be ensured? How will data regarding impact criteria be shared across programs?

- Other Solar for All programs have different geographic scopes, product types, workplan approaches, and launch timelines. Given the different focus among Solar for All awardees, a project ineligible for IPC's Solar for All financial assistance or technical assistance may be eligible for support from a different awardee's Solar for All program or vice versa.

Programmatically, there may be opportunities for solar developers to leverage CPC's Solar for All technical or financial assistance while receiving support from other Solar for All awardees, but outputs and outcomes may not be double counted. Solar for All supported projects may leverage other federal or local sources of funding, including solar investment tax credits, SRECs, LIHEAP, USDA, and similar funding, as well as private sources of capital. IPC's Solar for All program will avoid issuing financial assistance to projects that could be financed through other sources of funding.

IPC is in continual dialogue with other state and nonprofit Solar for All awardees and will actively seek to share best practices. Some of this may be facilitated by NREL, CESA, or the NCSP+ program.

14. Should proposers include a data sharing plan for possible efforts on state- or community-level impact reporting that are being administered by other SFA programs.

- No. Respondents do not need to provide a plan for sharing data with other Solar for All awardees. Data collection methodologies and program metrics and reports may be shared with others, including other Solar for All awardee teams, but respondents do not need to prepare a plan for data sharing with other Solar for All awardees.

15. Will the impact criteria created apply only to the programs the Community Power Coalition (CPC) administers? Or is the goal to provide guidance across the full Solar for All (SFA) portfolio?

- The services sought in this RFP are for IPC and its CPC Solar for All program, not the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (**EPA**) full Solar for All program portfolio.

16. Are you asking bidders to provide BOTH pricing for the Scope of Work/Services listed AND a rate sheet by title or only the rate sheet? If you want both, is there any format you would prefer we use for the pricing of the Scope of Work/Services? Would you prefer fixed fee or time and materials with Not to Exceed limits?

- Yes, IPC requests that bidders provide both:
 - i. Pricing for the Scope of Work/Services listed, which may be proposed as either a firm fixed fee or a time and materials (T&M) with not-to-exceed (NTE) limits, based on what the proposer deems most appropriate for the defined deliverables; and
 - ii. A rate sheet by labor category/title, which will support evaluation, negotiation, and pricing of future task orders or additional services under the award.

While IPC does not mandate a specific pricing format, we recommend that proposers clearly align their cost estimates with the major tasks and deliverables outlined in the Scope of Work.

Pricing should include assumptions, level of effort (e.g., hours), labor categories, and any applicable indirect costs or escalation.

IPC remains open to both fixed fee and T&M/NTE pricing structures and reserves the right to select the most appropriate approach during contract negotiation based on the nature of the work and funding considerations.

17. Do you intend for a single firm to perform the work associated with the specific scope of work outlined on pages 2 and 3 of this RFP or will you be awarding multiple firms spots on a bench to respond to task orders as needed for the work listed throughout the term of this project, so each task would require an additional bid/procurement exercise? Or would the bench be for additional work as needed, but not yet specified?

- IPC expects to contract with a single firm to complete the scope of work/services outlined in this RFP.

18. Can IPC please provide more details as to what type of response it is expecting for Section 4? For example, would IPC like the Respondent's Diversity Plan and/or programmatic approach to equity? Or would IPC like a response around Marketing, Education, and Outreach (ME&O) and community-based outreach (CBO) services and activities the Respondent has done and/or can perform?

- Commitment to Community Engagement and Equitable and Meaningful Impact focuses on how respondents engage with low-income and disadvantaged communities. A respondent's diversity plan and/or approach to equity may be demonstrative. IPC will evaluate Commitment to Community Engagement and Equitable and Meaningful Impact based on a variety of factors, including track record of working with low-income and disadvantaged communities. Examples to demonstrate this could include past projects or programs in these communities, the dollar amount of projects supported in these communities, experience working with and engaging low-income and disadvantaged communities, or engaging through partnerships or community-based organizations. The Evaluation Criteria for Financing Applications outlined in Section 5 of IPC's [Financing Products Program Guidance](#) (see page 24-25) may be instructive.

19. If a vendor is awarded to be the third-party administrator of other Solar for All programs in states where IPC is managing the Community Power Coalition's Powering America Together Program, would receiving an award under this RFP disqualify the vendor from administering other SFA programs managed by IPC due to a conflict of interest?

- Being selected as a vendor under this RFP does not automatically preclude an organization from providing services to another Solar for All award. Other Solar for All awardees may, at their discretion, determine that a conflict of interests with a vendor exists, and if so, whether and how it may be mitigated.

IPC reviews for and addresses any potential conflicts of interest in accordance with 2 CFR § 200.112 and § 200.318(c)(1).

To ensure compliance and fairness:

- i. All potential conflicts related to IPC and its work must be disclosed in advance,
- ii. IPC may require the implementation of internal firewalls, recusals, or other mitigation measures, and
- iii. IPC reserves the right to limit a vendor's scope of work if their dual roles could compromise the integrity of the program.

Each situation will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure adherence to federal conflict of interest standards and maintain the integrity of the Program.

20. Are standard year-over-year increases in rates, typically part of annual escalation adjustments, allowable?
- Yes, standard year-over-year rate increases that reflect reasonable annual escalation adjustments are allowable. However, any proposed escalation must be clearly stated in the cost proposal, including the basis and percentage of the increase. All proposed rate adjustments will be evaluated for reasonableness and consistency with industry standards and must comply with applicable federal cost principles under 2 CFR 200 Subpart E.
21. Is the grant fully funded by EPA to IPC? Is IPC the sole recipient of the grant?
- Yes, this work is fully funded by the EPA through a grant awarded to IPC. All other CPC members under the Program have received subawards of this grant.
22. Will the Respondent be required to hold any special licenses or certifications in the State of Connecticut?
- No. This RFP does not contemplate that respondents will hold any special licenses or certifications in the State of Connecticut.
23. We infer from the scope of work that IPC / CPC will be managing the program, including selection of target sites (i.e., Program beneficiaries), selected technologies, direct communications with Program beneficiaries, funds distribution, etc., and that the Respondent's scope is limited to the three topical areas in the opening paragraph, thus excluding all program and project management. Is this correct? If not correct, can you provide greater detail / drill-down on the distribution of responsibilities between IPC and Respondent?
- IPC and CPC member organizations are responsible for carrying out the Program, including project evaluation and financial assistance deployment. The services being sought focus on 1) Program impact reporting; 2) developing, applying, and supporting the implementation of methodologies for achieving a minimum household savings of 20% to Program beneficiaries; and 3) sample-auditing household savings for Program beneficiaries. Communication with Program beneficiaries may be required to complete this scope of work/services.
24. For "Scope" item (a), what is meant by "Developing, refining, and implementing ... targets..."? Are you indicating that the Respondent is expected to select the targets (i.e., Program beneficiaries)?
- No. Respondents will not be responsible for selecting Program beneficiaries. The word "targets" in that sentence refers to reasonable objectives to guide program efforts.
25. For "Scope" item (d), what is meant by "Supporting compliance..."? Are you indicating that the Respondent is responsible for compliance, or rather reporting on compliance?
- No. The selected respondent is not responsible for overall program compliance. With regard to item d), they are expected to support compliance activities related to the Program's 20% household savings methodologies. Examples of these activities include adhering to 20% household savings guidance, assessing and validating conformity with the Program's 20% savings methodologies, and reporting findings.
26. For "Scope" item (f), what is meant by "Sample-auditing..."? Is the referenced auditing to be done via provided data, photographs, virtual observation, or field observation? If these decisions are to be made on a case-by-case basis, who decides?

- Generally, we anticipate the data needed for sample audits will be provided by CPC members. However, there is the possibility that the selected vendor may need to use other sources of data that are not directly provided by CPC members. Random audits and spot reviews will require the selected vendor to complete energy performance monitoring and verification of projects funded under the Program, which may require utility bill releases from consumer subscription contracts.

27. For "Scope" items (a-f), what will be the source(s) of all data needed for auditing? Is IPC responsible for obtaining such data or is the Respondent or are both parties to be responsible? If the latter, how do you see responsibilities being distributed? Who decides?

- Generally, we anticipate the data needed for sample audits will be provided by CPC members. However, there is the possibility that the selected vendor may need to use other sources of data that are not directly provided by CPC members. Random audits and spot reviews will require the selected vendor to complete energy performance monitoring and verification of projects funded under the Program, which may require utility bill releases from consumer subscription contracts.

Other inputs for Scope of Work/Service items in this RFP may be derived from the EPA, CPC members, contractors, other program stakeholders, or collected through desktop research.

28. For "Scope" items (a-f), for all data used for auditing, who is responsible for validation and verification of data? Is IPC responsible or is the Respondent or are both parties to be responsible? If the latter, how do you see responsibilities being distributed? Who decides?

- IPC and other CPC members and their contractors are responsible for the validation and verification of the data to support household savings reporting and auditing. The selected vendor may assist with some data validation and verifications activities.

29. For "Deliverables" item (d), can you specify in greater detail the type and content of the guidance and training materials being requested?

- Deliverable d) states, "Guidance and training materials for IPC, CPC members, solar developers, and prospective Program beneficiaries on household savings, including education for CPC members and developers on how to implement and verify household savings for Program beneficiaries on expected savings over time, along with non-utility benefits and impacts." The guidance and training sought may be delivered through a variety of means, including written materials, webinars, and virtual presentations. The selected vendor will generally be responsible for generating and delivering the content of the training in consultation with IPC and other partners. Aims for the guidance and training include ensuring that IPC, CPC members, solar developers, and prospective Program beneficiaries understand how minimum household savings is calculated, that beneficiary savings expectations are met, and that savings methodologies are practicable and can be applied consistently.

30. For "Deliverables" item (e), are the reports on impact metrics and household savings achieved to be based only on received data, or will some type of observation be required? If observations are required, is it expected that these will be done via photographs, virtual observations, or field observations? If these decisions are to be made on a case-by-case basis, who decides?

- Generally, the reports on impact metrics and household savings achieved will be based on data provided by CPC members; however, it is possible the selected vendor will need to use other information and data-sourcing means to inform these reports. Other inputs to inform this deliverable may be derived from the EPA, CPC members, contractors, other program stakeholders, or from observations made during performance.

31. Similar to the preceding question, for "Deliverables" item (f), are the referenced audits to be done via photographs, virtual observations, or field observations? If these decisions are to be made on a case-by-case basis, who decides?

- Generally, we anticipate the data needed for sample audits will be provided by CPC members. However, there is the possibility that the selected vendor may need to use other sources of data that are not directly provided by CPC members. Random audits and spot reviews will require the selected vendor to complete energy performance monitoring and verification of projects funded under the program, which may require utility bill releases from consumer subscription contracts.

Other inputs for sample audits referenced may be derived from the EPA, CPC members, contractors, or other program stakeholders, or collected through desktop research.

32. Will the Respondent be allowed to apply a predetermined escalation factor to its rates for the four-year period of performance? Or is the Respondent required to utilize the same rates for the entire four-year period of performance?

- Yes, standard year-over-year rate increases that reflect reasonable annual escalation adjustments are allowable. However, any proposed escalation must be clearly stated in the cost proposal, including the basis and percentage of the increase. All proposed rate adjustments will be evaluated for reasonableness and consistency with industry standards and must comply with applicable federal cost principles under 2 CFR 200 Subpart E.

33. Is the contract type of "fixed-fee" meant to be "firm-fixed price?" If the work order contract type is meant to be "fixed fee," should the labor rates provided by the Respondent be fully burdened exclusive of profit?

- Yes, when referring to "fixed-fee," IPC intends the contract type to be interpreted as firm-fixed price for defined scopes of work or deliverables. If proposing under a firm-fixed price structure, labor rates provided in the accompanying rate sheet should be fully burdened and inclusive of all costs, including overhead, general and administrative (G&A) expenses, and profit. This allows IPC to understand the total cost basis for future pricing negotiations and ensures transparency and comparability across proposals. However, if you are proposing a time and materials (T&M) approach for certain tasks, you may itemize labor rates exclusive of profit, but please clearly indicate which structure you are applying in your cost narrative and pricing documentation.

34. Would IPC be open to a firm fixed fee pricing structure? If the firm fixed fee, would IPC still require a rate card?

- Yes, IPC is open to a firm fixed fee pricing structure for defined scopes of work. However, we still request that proposers submit a rate sheet as part of their cost proposal. Labor rates provided in the accompanying rate sheet should be fully burdened and inclusive of all costs, including overhead, general and administrative (G&A) expenses, and profit. This allows IPC to understand the total cost basis for future pricing negotiations and ensures transparency and comparability across proposals.

35. Will IPC provide its sample contract with terms and conditions for review? Or are the provisions under this section along with the required contract provisions found in 2 CFR 200 Appendix II expected to cover the entire terms of the prospective contract award?

- IPC will not be providing a separate sample contract at this stage of the solicitation. The terms and conditions governing the resulting agreement will be based on:

- i. The provisions outlined in the RFP and any associated attachments;
- ii. Applicable federal requirements, including those contained in 2 CFR 200 Appendix II; and
- iii. IPC's standard subcontractor agreement, which will incorporate required flow-down clauses from IPC's award with the EPA.

Final terms, including any additional conditions, reporting requirements, or administrative provisions, will be negotiated with the selected contractor(s) prior to execution of the contract or issuance of task orders. If selected for an award, the Respondent will have the opportunity to review and negotiate the full contract terms during the contracting phase.

36. Is the Respondent allowed to apply profit on its costs?

- Yes, respondents are permitted to include profit in their proposed pricing. Profit should be:
 - i. Clearly identified in the cost proposal;
 - ii. Separated from direct labor, fringe, overhead, and G&A (if applicable); and
 - iii. Reasonable and consistent with industry standards and federal cost principles under 2 CFR 200 Subpart E.

Profit may be applied to firm-fixed price proposals or to labor rates in a time and materials pricing structure, provided it is fully disclosed. IPC reserves the right to evaluate the reasonableness of proposed profit margins during the review and negotiation phase.

37. What is the expected quantity of target sites (i.e., Program beneficiaries)?

- This information is unknown at this time and may depend on ongoing program developments, procured pipeline applications, and implementation priorities. IPC and CPC lenders have financial assistance deployment targets—CPC aims to deploy \$187 million in financial assistance over the period of performance across all the program models we are seeking to scale—but does not have an expected number of target sites presently.

38. What is the expected range of geographic locations of the target sites?

- The program covers AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. The program's coverage is also displayed on [IPC's About Solar for All page](#). Sites may span some or all these geographies.

39. Who is designing and selecting the technologies and systems to be used at the target sites (i.e., Program beneficiaries)?

- IPC and CPC lenders under the Program are required to procure their pipelines of projects to support with financial assistance. Applicants seeking financial assistance are required to provide a P.E. signed and stamped engineering, site, and construction plan and a financial pro forma. Project eligibility and evaluation criteria for financing applications can be found in [IPC's Financing Products Program Guidance](#).

40. Is it correct that the Program will use only solar photovoltaic technologies and equipment and, for example, not use any other technologies such as battery energy storage technologies? If correct, what is the expected range of equipment capacities (e.g., solar PV module size, inverter size)?

- Solar for All grant funds must be used for financial assistance and technical assistance to enable low-income and disadvantaged communities to deploy and benefit from rooftop residential solar and residential-serving community solar. Infrastructure to store solar-generated power for the purposes of maximizing residential rooftop and residential-serving community solar deployment that is deployed in conjunction with an eligible project is allowed, but neither stand-alone energy storage nor other energy efficiency upgrades or technologies are allowed. To be eligible to receive Solar for All financial assistance, projects must have photovoltaic panels with nameplate capacity up to 5 MWac. Other project eligibility information can be found in [IPC's Financing Products Program Guidance](#).

41. Can a vendor provide a response to both this RFP as well as the SFA Program Finance RFP? Similarly, would the winning proposer for this RFP be conflicted for any work provided in the SFA Program Finance RFP (and vice versa)?

- Yes, a vendor may submit a response to both this RFP and the Impact Reporting and Household RFP, provided they meet the qualifications and requirements outlined in each solicitation.

Regarding potential conflicts of interest:

IPC reviews for and addresses any potential conflicts of interest in accordance with 2 CFR § 200.112 and § 200.318(c)(1).

To ensure compliance and fairness:

- i. All potential conflicts related to IPC and its work must be disclosed in advance,
- ii. IPC may require the implementation of internal firewalls, recusals, or other mitigation measures, and
- iii. IPC reserves the right to limit a vendor's scope of work if their dual roles could compromise the integrity of the program.

Each situation will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure adherence to federal conflict of interest standards and maintain the integrity of the Program.

42. Can you confirm that "household savings" in this RFP is defined as electric utility savings, consistent with the EPA NOFO's Meaningful Benefit targets?

- Solar for All supported multifamily projects require a 20% minimum household savings net of costs incurred by the Low-Income and Disadvantaged Community household over the period of performance. The minimum 20% household savings is in reference to the household's monthly cost of electricity on average per year. The CPC's Household Savings Methodology [can be found here](#).

43. Does IPC have a sense for how it plans to define and calculate its household savings metric? (e.g. annual vs. monthly calculation; 20% of full utility costs vs. generation costs)

- The CPC's Household Savings Methodology [is outlined here](#).

44. Does IPC anticipate its calculation for household savings to be consistent throughout its service territory?

- IPC will apply the [CPC's Household Savings Methodology](#) for all of the projects we support under our Program. The methodology has different frameworks for calculating community solar and multifamily savings. The methodology recognizes that there may be differences in bill credit

rate, non-bypassable bill cost, available data and net-metering policies across geographies. Project structures and metering and household size will vary too. While the basic savings methodology will be consistently applied across our Program, these differences may lead to some variation in calculating household savings.

45. Can you please elaborate on the expectation for Scope of work f) "Sample-auditing of household savings for program beneficiaries." Would this be considered an internal audit for internal review, or be considered 3rd party audit and assurance?

- As part of our project work plan, Community Power Coalition members have committed to audit provided data of household saving realization rates. Since it is Community Power Coalition commitment made in our EPA-approved work plan, we consider it to be an internal audit. However, we will be reporting on household savings to the EPA and expect rigorous audit standards and methods to be applied.

46. Scope of Service c) suggests that IPC and CPC will have a team stood up to execute the ongoing monitoring activities, suggesting that this scope of work is limited to developing the methodologies, providing coaching to IPC/CPC staff, and reviewing their work. Can you confirm this to be the case, and that IPC does not expect the contractor to conduct ongoing monitoring activities?

- No. The RFP describes the Scope of Work/Service being sought. IPC is engaged in ongoing monitoring activities and has, or may yet, procure some Program support services but respondents should expect to conduct the full range of activities outlined in this RFP.

47. Section 5 states that there will be multiple awards, with subsequent work orders; however, Section 6 suggests delivery of a defined Scope of Work. Can you please clarify the expected contract structure and service delivery model?

- Impact Reporting and Minimum Household Savings RFP Addendum #2 deleted the Section 5 provision suggesting more than one firm may be awarded under this RFP. IPC expects to contract with a single firm to complete the scope of work/services outlined in this RFP.

48. Are there any page limits/ requirements associated with the respective sections? Any page limitations on overall proposal submittal?

- There are no page limits or formatting requirements associated with the respective sections or the overall proposal submission. However, applicants are encouraged to be clear, concise, and focused in their responses to ensure efficient and effective evaluation by the review team.

49. If we would like to respond to both RFPs, may we include them in the same RFP response and simply submit an expanded Technical Approach and Scope Alignment section? Or would you prefer two separate RFP responses, even if there is overlapping content in the Letter of Transmittal, Organizational Background, Experience, Team and References, Cost Effectiveness and Commitment to Community Engagement and Equitable and Meaningful Impact sections?

- If you intend to respond to both RFPs, we ask that you submit two separate RFP responses—one for each solicitation. While we understand there may be overlapping content (e.g., Organizational Background, Team, Experience, etc.), separating the responses will help ensure clarity during the evaluation process and alignment with the specific scope, evaluation criteria, and deliverables outlined in each RFP.

50. Are you able to share an available budget estimate for the two RFPs?

- At this time, we are not able to share a budget estimate. Vendors are encouraged to propose a cost structure that is reasonable, competitive, and aligned with the scope of work and level of effort required.

*****All other items remain the same*****

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 4