



February 25, 2025

ADDENDUM NUMBER ONE

RE: RFP 001-25 Child Support Enforcement
Date of Issue: February 12, 2025
Revised Due Date: March 7, 2025
Time: 2:00 PM, EST

This is Addendum Number One to the referenced Request for Proposal and shall become part of the bid. The following questions were submitted:

The Proposal due date has been changed from March 5, 2025 to March 7, 2025. Proposals will not be accepted after 2:00 PM EST on March 7, 2025.

1. **Question:** The Cover of the RFP, Key Information Summary Sheet, and Sections C.3 and C.4 indicate the proposal is due on March 5, 2025 at 2:00 PM EST; however, Section C.1 states February 21, 2025 at 2:00 PM EST.

Could the County please provide the submission date for the proposal?

Answer: This was a clerical error. However, please see above for the revised due date of March 7, 2025 at 2:00 PM EST.

2. **Question:** Would the County consider accepting only an electronic proposal in lieu of both a printed and electronic copy? The timeline for submission is already short, and by allowing for only electronic submissions the County would provide vendors extra days to work on their proposals.

Answer: Unfortunately, the County is unable to only accept electronic copies at this time. Please submit both an electronic copy and one original, as requested in the RFP.

3. **Question:** Would the County clarify what is meant by the term "project plan" used on page 6, Section 3, first bullet? We think of a project plan as a PMBOK compliant chart of interrelated tasks with beginning and ending dates, that includes Milestones and Deliverables, typically covering a time-limited and discrete goal to accomplish. The vendor does acknowledge that a Project Plan will be included to cover its Transition Plan from page 6, Section 6, and we are more familiar with a project plan in that context.

In responding to Section 3, may a vendor submit a narrative description to cover the delivery of services, including timeframes and tasks as appropriate, in lieu of a formal "Project Plan" when addressing the performance of services identified in the RFP?

Answer: The vendor can submit a narrative description of their plan for implementing a Child Support Enforcement Plan if the times, tasks, and resources associated with the performance of services as identified in the RFP are included.



4. **Question:** The RFP (E8c.) requires at least one FTE for every 475 cases. The State of North Carolina recommends one FTE per 300-325 cases. The current vendor operates at a ratio of one FTE for every 385 cases. Would the County amend E8c. and recommend one FTE per 375 cases, or some other number less than the current minimum requirement?

Answer: The offeror is required to provide at least 1 FTE for every 475 cases so they would have the discretion to establish lower staffing ratios and differing cost proposals would be considered.

5. **Question:** Will the County allow vendors to submit different pricing that corresponds to different staffing levels? For example, would the county consider a cost proposal that corresponds to a staffing ratio of one FTE per 475 cases, a different cost proposal for one FTE per 375 cases, etc.?

Answer: The offeror is required to provide at least 1 FTE for every 475 cases so they would have the discretion to establish lower staffing ratios and differing cost proposals would be considered.

6. **Question:** This requirement instructs offerors to submit their proposals by 2:00 PM (EST) on March 5, 2025. It also instructs offerors to submit “one original and one (1) electronic copy”, which is to emailed to Christina Russell. However, when shipping a hard copy and to ensure timely delivery, offerors must allow two full days for shipping. For this proposal, that means offerors will have to ship the hard copy of their proposal on March 3rd to ensure on-time delivery. This time frame allows just a little over two weeks to produce a comprehensive and fully compliant proposal. To allow for an open and competitive procurement, we ask Onslow County to consider extending the submission date to March 7th or, at a minimum, having offerors submit the electronic copy by the stated March 5th due date, with the hard copy to follow by March 7th.

Answer: Unfortunately, the County is unable to only accept electronic copies at this time. Please submit both an electronic copy and one original, as requested in the RFP. However, the County has revised the due date to March 7, 2025 at 2:00 PM EST.

7. **Question:** Is the contractor responsible for service of process fees or costs associated with the use of sheriff staff for service of process? If yes, please provide the total costs related to service of process paid by the current contractor for each of the last three years.

Answer: Sheriff fees and drug screens are paid by the County.

8. **Question:** Is the contractor responsible for paying court filing fees? If yes, please provide the total cost of filing fees the current contractor has paid for each of the last three years.

Answer: These are paid for by the County.

9. **Question:** Please provide the salary of the existing child support staff and their respective positions.

Answer: Services are currently contracted out to Young Williams, and the County does not retain this information.

10.

11. **Question:** How many of the 18 staff dedicated to the Onslow County Child Support Services office are physically located in the Jacksonville office?

Answer: Services are currently contracted out to Young Williams, and the County does not retain this information.

12. **Question:** Is the current contractor currently imaging case documents? If so, has it completely imaged all active case files? If not, what percentage of active case files have been completely imaged?

Answer: Services are currently contracted out to Young Williams, and the County does not retain this information.

13. **Question:** How many court days per month does the office have?

Answer: 5-7 Days per month

14. **Question:** Would the County consider a fixed-fee payment structure for this contract, which would reduce risk and provide more certainty to both the Contractor and the County? Historically, percentage of collections contracts were designed to improve performance at a time when the caseload was growing and new enforcement tools were being added, but that time has passed. Now the program has matured and sharply declining TANF referrals have led to stagnating collections across the State and the nation except when collections were artificially elevated by COVID-related payments. In this environment, a fixed-fee structure avoids the potential volatility and unpredictability of a collections-based structure and becomes more predictable for both parties to the contract.

Answer: The County would like to stay with the collections-based structure and collect based on specific charges and not a flat fee.

Respectfully,

Christina Russell

Christina Russell, CLGPO
Purchasing Division Manager