

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 22-30

Grant Reporting and Compliance Consultant

Due: April 14, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. (local time)

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any) and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes three (3) pages.**

The Offeror is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment B - Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: Could you please provide potential funding estimates in addition to the American Rescue Plan Act?

Answer 1: For the current fiscal year, funding has returned to pre-pandemic levels. We recently issued \$6.1 million as part of the State Drinking Water Revolving Fund program. The portion of Federal funding to be included in that amount is unknown at this time. There are no other significant federal awards that have been identified. Please see the City website for Single Audit history here: <https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/financial-reporting/Pages/default.aspx>.

It is likely that the number of Federal awards will increase in future years. It is the desire of management to develop a system and have it in place so that if/when more federal funding is available in the future, the City will be well positioned to apply for, manage, and report out on those awards.

Question 2: How many subrecipients are expected to be monitored by these funding streams?

Answer 2: Unknown. Outside of ARPA, the City has no subrecipients. After Council approves final allocations there is potential that a number of subrecipient relationships could exist. We hope to have a uniform process in place to identify those relationships and monitor and eventually audit activities (both financially and programmatically).

Question 3: Approximately how much of the funding has already been disbursed?

Answer 3: None of the ARPA funding has been disbursed and allocations are still under Council review. Some options that Council is discussing are on the City website here: <https://www.a2gov.org/departments/systems-planning/Pages/American-Rescue-Plan-Act-Funding-.aspx> but no final allocations have been made. Existing programs have a couple hundred thousand in expenditures to date.

Question 4: Does the City have a dedicated team to work with the firm?

Answer 4: The Accounting Services Manager will be the primary point person during the engagement and the one dedicated to work with the firm. It is expected that there will be some contact with others in the financial and administrative services area and more limited interactions on the programmatic side with other non-financial services areas.

Question 5: Does the City have a grants management system, or would you expect the firm to provide a system to meet the needs of applications, budgets and monitoring?

Answer 5: The City currently uses the existing accounting system, Tyler (formerly New World Systems) LOGOS software, to track and account for grants. Given the historically few Federal awards, this has been sufficient for City needs. With the implementation of ARPA and the desire to expand our utilization of federal awards in the future and there is a Grants Management module in the current software, but the City is open to suggestions.

Question 6: Does the City currently have a system for tracking grant-specific financial and programmatic metrics?

Answer 6: While policies exist around federal awards, no standard nor grant-specific financial and programmatic metrics are tracked exactly the same way across all service areas. It is desirable to have more uniform practices and documentation across the various service areas to ensure proper recording, reporting, and reconciling is occurring.

Question 7: Would you provide the types of sub-recipients to be managed and potential number of sub-recipients to be monitored?

Answer 7: The types of subrecipients could range from nonprofit organizations, private entities, other governments, etc. Without final ARPA approval, it is difficult to determine this exactly. The City encourages you to review the documentation from the website linked in Question 3 above for more specifics. The selected firm would not be expected to directly manage nor interact with subrecipients. Rather, the firm would be tasked with getting a solid process in place that meets Uniform Guidance and other requirements which can be understood and used by all City staff going forward.

Question 8: Should the reporting and compliance services include reviewing the current procurement policies and identifying instances of noncompliance with uniform guidance?

Answer 8: Yes.

Question 9: Should the reporting and compliance services include documenting methodologies used by management regarding the subrecipients monitoring requirements of the Uniform Guidance?

Answer 9: Yes.

Question 10: Should the reporting and compliance services include providing training to the subrecipients from the tools and procedures noted in the Scope of Services to assist the City in continued monitoring efforts?

Answer 10: No. Interactions would be limited to City personnel. Staff training, particularly with those outside of the financial services area, would be a desired component of the engagement. While the City could be furnished with these tools and procedures, it would be the City's responsibility to relay the information to the selected subrecipient.

Question 11: Should the reporting and compliance services include assessing the internal controls and processes involved to monitor subrecipients, including subrecipient risk assessments?

Answer 11: Yes, this would be a desirable component to the engagement.

Question 12: Should the reporting and compliance services include assisting management with the documentation of the contractor vs. subrecipient evaluation?

Answer 12: Possibly. Basic determination checklists exist that describe the elements of Uniform Guidance as they relate to contract vs. subrecipient evaluation. This document could be strengthened or modified or replaced altogether.

Question 13: Will the City need the firm to assist with procurement?

Answer 13: Possibly. Procurement policies and procedures as well as contract template agreements already contain some federal award language. The firm would need to review existing policies and procurement documents to suggest areas of improvement or in need of updating. No further interaction with procurement is probable, unless areas of noncompliance are identified during the engagement. The City does not expect the firm to procure anything on the City's behalf.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.