

Attachment: B

Health and Human Services RFP Scoring Tool

Employee Name, Agency, Role:

HHS RFP Scoring Tool: RFP-HHS-2026-14

Criteria	Yes	No
Proposal was received by the deadline of 4:00 PM PST on October 30, 2026	☐	☐
Proposal includes all required components as outlined in Sections V and VI	☐	☐

Prohibited Contract or Other Disqualifying Conditions:

- ☐ Pass
- ☐ Fail

Total Points Available: 100

Successful proposals will show:

- Demonstrated experience leading strategic refresh projects
- Ability to recognize problems and course correct efficiently
- Clear strategies over stakeholder engagement and management.
- Experience performing gap analysis and Root Driver Synthesis
- The ability to create an implementation roadmap

Section 1 – Facilitation and Group Work (33 Points)

Reference: Section II.D (Facilitated Working Sessions), II.C (Target Population)

Criteria	Max Points	Evaluation Considerations	Score Awarded	Reviewer Comments
1.1 Facilitation Approach and Workplan	18	Quality and feasibility of meeting sequence, facilitation methods, decision-making structure,		

		working sessions, interviews/listening sessions, pre-reads, post-session outputs, and ability to produce clear decisions.		
1.2 Project Management Capacity	5	Staffing, schedule control, risk mitigation, bi-weekly status updates, responsiveness, and ability to complete the refresh on the approved timeline.		
1.3 Cost Proposal and Value	10	Reasonableness and clarity of budget; total not-to-exceed amount; task/deliverable alignment; labor hours/rates; direct and subcontractor costs; value relative to scope; no costs for developing a strategic refresh.		

Section 2 – Strategic Refresh Development, Implementation, and Organization (37 points)

Reference: Section II.D

Criteria	Max Points	Evaluation Considerations	Score Awarded	Reviewer Comments
2.1 Understanding of Purpose and Scope Fit	10	Proposal understands this is a facilitation-driven Strategic Refresh, not a new strategic plan; focuses on course corrections, implementation priorities, gaps, root drivers, and roadmap development.		
2.2 Gap Analysis, Root Driver Synthesis, Data-Informed	15	Method for baseline review, current-state summary, gap framework, distinguishing symptoms from root drivers, using		

Approach, and Iterative Drafting		quantitative/qualitative data, synthesizing input, and maintaining a rolling Strategic Refresh draft.		
2.3 Implementation Roadmap and Deliverables Quality	12	Approach to producing clear, decision-ready post-session summaries, final report, slide deck, and roadmap with actions, owners/partners, timelines, dependencies, and indicators.		

Section 3 – Equity, Inclusion, and Responsiveness (30 Points)

Reference: Sections I.A (Racial Equity Commitment), II.C (Target Population)

Criteria	Max Points	Evaluation Considerations	Score Awarded	Reviewer Comments
3.1 Stakeholder Engagement, Lived Experience, and Equity	15	Engagement plan covers required stakeholder groups, meaningfully includes people with lived experience, addresses racial equity and culturally responsive engagement, and explains how input will be supported, incorporated, and validated.		
3.2 Relevant Qualifications, Homelessness System Knowledge, and Work Samples	10	Relevant experience with public-sector or CoC systems; knowledge of Coordinated Entry, outreach, shelter, housing interventions, behavioral health, healthcare, justice, prevention/diversion;		

		quality of references and work samples.		
3.3 Neutrality and Conflict of Interest Management	5	Disclosure of conflicts, mitigation plan, independence, and ability to serve as a trusted neutral facilitator across County, CoC, provider, and lived-experience partners.		

Criteria	Max Points
Total	110

Reviewer Summary Section

Key Strengths	
Key Concerns	
Clarifying Questions	
Recommended for Interview	
Final Recommendation	

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

I, the reviewer, submitted my Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statement:

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No