COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2766
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

J. TYLER McCAULEY
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

March 7, 2002

TO: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chair
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

FROM: J. Tyler McCauley
Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: **Review of ACS State and Local Solutions' Concerns Over Vendor Selection for Job Readiness and Career Planning Services Program**

At the request of the Fourth Supervisorial District, my office has investigated claims made by ACS State and Local Solutions (ACS) (formerly Lockheed Martin – IMS) concerning the vendor selections made in conjunction with the Department of Public Social Services' (DPSS) Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Job Readiness and Career Planning Services Program (Job Club). Based on the issues identified by ACS, the Fourth Supervisorial District developed a set of five key issues for which they requested our review and response.

During our review, we interviewed personnel from DPSS' Job Readiness and Career Planning Services section, and contacted personnel from the top three rated vendors that submitted a proposal in response to the above referenced RFP. We also reviewed the evaluation instrument used to evaluate the proposals and the Business Proposals submitted by MAXIMUS, ACS and Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) including the corresponding Cost Proposals.

Conclusion

Our review disclosed a significant problem with the evaluation process. In the cost analysis, certain location costs which are to be billed to the County were not included in the cost comparisons. DPSS took this position because they believed including one-time costs for an incoming vendor gave LACOE an advantage. We believe they must be included because they will be billed to the County.

We also noted that DPSS' original scoring of the proposals only considered the proposer's cost for one year and not the cost over the term of the agreement. We also determined DPSS treated the cost for Teen Passport to Success (TPS) as a monthly

cost, when in fact it is a "per session" cost. This resulted in each proposer's cost for TPS being overstated.

We recalculated the scoring to adjust for these factors. The recalculated scores (Attachment I) did not result in any changes to the rankings of the top three proposals. The final result would be MAXIMUS rated highest in four regions and LACOE the highest rated in three regions. However, we did note that in some instances the differences between the scores is very small. As an example, in Region II, MAXIMUS' total score is 921 points compared to LACOE's score of 913 points, for a difference of 8 points out of a possible 1,050 points. Similarly, in Region V, only 14 points separates MAXIMUS' total score of 921 to LACOE's score of 907 points.

The following is a description of the key issues identified by the Fourth Supervisorial District, with the results of our review of these issues.

Background

The RFP for the Job Readiness and Career Planning Services Program was issued in May 2001 and responses were provided to DPSS on June 20, 2001. Under the provisions of the RFP, a vendor could submit a proposal to serve all seven available Regional Service Areas (RSAs), or propose to serve individual RSAs. DPSS selected two vendors, MAXIMUS and the LACOE to serve the seven RSAs. ACS, who is not being recommended for a contract award by DPSS, has alleged several flaws exist in the vendor selection process. Based on this information, representatives of the Fourth Supervisorial District identified five key issues which they requested us to review.

Results of Review of Key Issues

Issue # 1: ACS says that the RFP stated there could be no co-location with DPSS. However, LACOE's bid includes co-locating in most regions. Is LACOE permitted to co-locate?

The RFP does indicate that for Job Club the Contractor(s) is required to provide space for the Job Club sites and cannot co-locate at the DPSS offices.

ACS' observation that LACOE is proposing to co-locate staff in GAIN Regional offices is based on comments included in LACOE's Budget Narrative. As an example, the narrative for Rent/Lease Building for Region 2 indicates, " Funds are required for a portion of rent expenses for contract staff located at GAIN Headquarters. Cost is based on prior year's expenditure for this program".

We contacted LACOE and requested that LACOE respond to ACS' observation. LACOE indicated the following: "When we state funds are required for a portion of rent expenses for contract staff located at GAIN Headquarters, we are referring to LACOE staff located at LACOE GAIN Headquarters. Since all expenses for this program needed to be allocated regionally, we needed to prorate rent for administration over the

7 regions. This amount includes rent for a portion of our director and other administrators and support staff. We do not intend to co-locate Job Services staff at (County) GAIN Regional Facilities."

Conclusion: It does not appear that LACOE contemplated the co-location of LACOE staff at DPSS' GAIN Regional offices.

Issue # 2: MAXIMUS' staffing numbers are about half of what ACS and LACOE proposed. Can they provide quality services with such a small staff? (especially the Regions that require two sites). How can MAXIMUS serve two sites with only 5.4 staff?

The staffing totals for Orientation and Job Club for the three top rated proposals, including any staff to be furnished by subcontractors are as follows:

	Regional Service Area							
Proposer	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	Total
ACS	16.02	17.02	23.02	24.02	22.02	21.02	N/A	123.12
MAXIMUS	10.05	9.04	11.07	13.11	14.13	14.13	8.02	79.55
LACOE	10.09	13.48	18.60	16.89	19.14	20.40	6.84	105.44
LACOE (Current Actuals)	9.97	11.98	17.63	16.78	19.11	18.94	5.65	100.06

LACOE is the incumbent contractor in all seven Regions of the County. We evaluated LACOE's current actual workloads for Orientation and Job Search Services and noted that each are within approximately 15% of the caseload forecast included in the RFP. LACOE's current actual staffing at December 2001 was approximately 100 positions Countywide. We reviewed DPSS' monitoring reports for the first three quarters of calendar year 2001 and noted no deficiencies cited that would indicate LACOE might be understaffed.

LACOE's cost proposal includes approximately 105.5 positions Countywide. There are differences between the scope of work in the RFP and the scope of work that LACOE is currently performing. According to LACOE, the additional positions along with some service delivery strategy changes, will enable them to adequately serve the projected participant population.

Assuming LACOE's estimate of staffing needs for Orientation and Job Services are reasonable, MAXIMUS' estimate of staffing needs appears to be low. We requested MAXIMUS to review and comment on the information contained in the table above. MAXIMUS concluded that there are two primary reasons for the differences. The first is that LACOE's position count includes certain administrative positions that MAXIMUS classified as indirect costs. MAXIMUS identified three administrative positions for a total of 1.6 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) positions that were not discreetly identified in

their budgets and included in their position counts. MAXIMUS also believes that the LACOE is overstaffed for Orientation Services. It is MAXIMUS' contention that Orientation Services can be provided by between 1.1 and 2.2 FTE Line Staff positions for Orientation per Region, depending on the estimated caseload.

For five of the seven regions, LACOE's budgets included between 3.19 and 5.14 FTE Line Staff positions, with the remaining two regions staffed by between 2.05 and 2.12 FTE positions. In some of the Regions where MAXIMUS is proposing 1.1 FTE Line Staff for Orientation, co-location at more than one County GAIN facility will be required. For example, in Region II where MAXIMUS is proposing to use 1.1 staff for Orientation, the Contractor will be required to provide Orientation services at two separate facilities. According to MAXIMUS, it is their intention to "float" their personnel between locations. MAXIMUS does not believe that the volume of new participants is sufficient enough to warrant having staff at each County facility dedicated to providing Orientation services. We reviewed the Orientation Motivational Services Monthly Reports that LACOE prepared documenting attendance at English-speaking Orientation sessions for May 2001 thorough October 2001. During this period it appeared that most locations offered Orientation sessions daily. We noted that the average number of participants beginning an Orientation session ranged from a low of 7.97 participants per session to a high of 10.09 participants per session. DPSS indicated that most locations offer Orientation services to their Spanish-speaking participants between two and three times per week. The average class size for Spanish speaking Orientation sessions was between 2.42 and 5.13 participants per session. Accordingly, the actual average number of participants in an Orientation session is less than half the maximum class size of 25 participants. We discussed MAXIMUS' strategy for maximizing the number of participants in their Orientation sessions with DPSS. DPSS advised us that utilization of a staggered schedule is permissible and that this strategy has been employed by DPSS in consultation with LACOE to increase class sizes when there is a drop in their referral rates.

In any event, MAXIMUS stated that if their staffing is insufficient, they will provide additional staffing without increasing costs to ensure satisfactory performance.

We also computed the ratio of participants to line staff for each of the proposers for both the Job Search Services and Orientation functions (Attachment II). For Job Search Services, we noted that these ratios were comparable between LACOE and MAXIMUS, indicating that the levels of line staff proposed by these two contractors were not materially different.

Conclusion: While in total MAXIMUS' proposed staffing appears low in comparison to the other proposers, the number of line staff dedicated to providing Job Search Services is comparable to the staffing levels proposed by the incumbent contractor, LACOE. As discussed previously, DPSS' monitoring reports have not indicated that LACOE's performance is deficient and current actual caseloads are comparable to the projected caseloads in the RFP. Accordingly, we conclude from this that MAXIMUS' line staff

level for Job Search Services, which is comparable to that being proposed by LACOE, is reasonable.

MAXIMUS' proposed staffing for Orientation services is low compared to LACOE's staffing. However, MAXIMUS has indicated that it intends to utilize a staggered scheduling approach to conduct Orientation sessions to maximize the number of participants per session. DPSS has indicated that this approach has been permissible when developed in consultation with the Department.

Issue # 3: ACS does not think that MAXIMUS' one-time cost for rent was included in the total program costs.

The estimated "One Time Tenant Improvements" identified by the three top rated proposers in their proposals are as follows:

	Multi-Disciplinary Family Team			Job Club Site		
	MAXIMUS	LACOE	ACS	MAXIMUS	LACOE	ACS
Region I	$37,551	-	-	$ 84,490	-	-
Region II	$37,551	-	-	$ 68,531	-	-
Region III	$75,102	-	-	$112,653	-	-
Region IV	$75,102	-	-	$132,367	-	-
Region V	$75,102	-	-	$132,367	-	-
Region VI	$75,102	-	-	$132,367	-	-
Region VII	$37,551	-	-	$ 52,571	-	-

ACS did not include a provision for these costs in their cost proposal and indicated that they do not intend to charge for them. ACS stated that they consider these costs a cost of doing business and will absorb the costs. Although they indicated that they would incur on-time costs, LACOE's provision for one-time costs was not included in their cost proposal. Subsequently, LACOE amended their proposal to reflect these costs. However, they have indicated that they would be willing to stand by their bid price included in their proposal.

ACS' assertion that "One Time Tenant Improvements for Job Club Site" identified in MAXIMUS' proposal were not included in total program costs in DPSS' evaluation is accurate. Although included in the budgets, these costs were not included as part of the Total Monthly Costs of operating the Job Club for purposes of evaluating MAXIMUS' Cost Proposal.

Our review of the RFP disclosed that the issue of "One-Time Tenant Improvements" and the treatment of those costs in the vendor's budget and bid sheets was not addressed.

We discussed with DPSS their rationale for excluding these one-time costs from the evaluation of the vendor's cost proposals. DPSS explained that, as the incumbent

contractor, LACOE had already made a number of improvements and had previously been reimbursed for them. DPSS reasoned that since an incoming vendor would not have the option of occupying an existing LACOE facility, they would not be able to take advantage of one-time improvements previously made. Accordingly, DPSS reasoned that the one-time costs that an incoming vendor would incur would be much more extensive than the one-time costs that LACOE would incur, making it inappropriate to consider these costs as this would result in an unfair advantage for LACOE.

Conclusion: We disagree with DPSS' decision to exclude the "One Time Tenant Improvement" costs from the evaluation of the proposer's Cost Proposals. It is our opinion that the selection of a contractor consider all costs that the County will be billed for.

We also disagree with DPSS' decision to allow LACOE to submit an estimate of their one-time costs after the submission of their proposal to the County. We have contacted LACOE and they have indicated that they would be willing to stand by the bid price included in their proposal.

DPSS had indicated that after having a discussion with County Counsel, the tenant improvement estimates received from LACOE after the submission of their proposal to the County will be removed from the proposed Job Readiness Contract with LACOE.

Issue # 4: MAXIMUS' rent cost are half of what ACS proposed. Are those reasonable/realistic amounts for rent, for adequate space?

In reviewing the budget sheets for the three top rated proposals, we noted that rent (space) costs for Job Search Services for Regions I through VI (ACS did not bid on Region VII) are as follows:

	Regional Service Area					
Provider	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
ACS	$5,833	$5,318	$7,824	$ 8,842	$7,824	$ 7,824
MAXIMUS	$7,158	$6,416	$9,043	$10,630	$9,919	$ 9,919
LACOE	$3,400	$4,100	$7,276	$ 7,283	$7,267	$10,374

As the table above indicates, MAXIMUS' provision for rent costs is not half of that proposed by ACS. In fact, it exceeds ACS' rent provision in all six regions. We reviewed ACS' presentation on this issue to determine how this conclusion was reached. We determined that ACS had erroneously compared its cost for subcontractors to MAXIMUS' rent cost. Subcontractor costs were much more substantial than the provision for rent expense. As an example, in Region III, ACS' rent cost for Job Search Services is $7,824, whereas, its subcontractor costs for this region are $19,922, which is the amount that ACS compared to MAXIMUS' rent cost.

Conclusion: ACS' observation that MAXIMUS' rent cost was half of what ACS was proposing is incorrect. As the table above indicates, MAXIMUS' provision for rents was consistently higher than the provision included by ACS.

Issue # 5: They (ACS) raised the same issues of changed methodology and the bonus points. How were points awarded for "above and beyond"? Were evaluators given guidance?

We reviewed the RFP and corresponding evaluation instrument and noted the following:

Bonus Points

The RFP provided for Bonus points for the proposer under certain conditions, as follows:

- Up to 50 points were available to contractors who have Community-Based Organization (CBO) status (as defined in the RFP), or propose to subcontract, joint venture with a CBO for one of three major service components.

- Up to 15 points were available to contractors who demonstrated experience in placing GAIN participants with a criminal history in employment.

We noted that the top three vendors (ACS, LACOE and MAXIMUS) were all awarded the maximum of 50 points for establishing CBO status/subcontacting with a CBO for one of three major service components in each of the seven Regional Service Areas.

None of the top three vendors received bonus points demonstrating experience in placing GAIN participants with criminal histories in employment.

Conclusion: Based on the outcome of the scoring of the bonus sections of the proposal evaluation, none of the three top vendors gained an advantage over their competitors since all three vendors received the same scores.

Change in Proposal Scoring Methodology

The RFP in question was preceded by an earlier RFP, which was cancelled by DPSS. We noted that the scoring methodology utilized in the current RFP does differ from that included in the original RFP. Under the current RFP, there was greater variation in the scoring scale used to evaluate individual criteria. As an example, under Evaluation Criteria E.2, Curriculum for Orientation, a Meets Requirements response would receive 10 points, whereas, a response which Exceeds Requirements would receive 15 points. The Curriculum for Job Club, awarded 210 points to a presentation which Exceeds Requirements, whereas a response which Meets Requirements would receive 140 points. In contrast, these criteria were rated on a 0 to 5 points scale under the previous RFP.

According to DPSS representatives, the current RFP required proposers to provide more detailed information about their services, experiences and qualifications. In order to rate this additional information, the Department indicated that it was necessary to expand the rating categories and increase the number of evaluation points. The Department believes that these changes also permitted greater emphasis on proposers' curriculum development for core services of the program.

Conclusion: While the changes in the scoring scenario were not communicated to the proposers prior to the submission of their proposals, County Counsel has advised us that the County had no legal obligation to notify proposers of these changes. All proposals received were subject to the same scoring methodology and would have been in an equal position to take advantage of the additional points available in DPSS' areas of increased emphasis.

Award of Points "Above and Beyond"

We identified instances where one or more proposers received "above and beyond" points (i.e., "above and beyond" points refers to a rating of an evaluation criteria higher than a "Meets Requirements, or "Qualified" rating) on an evaluation criteria. We reviewed both the summary rating sheets for the three proposers (where the ratings of the five evaluators are summarized) along with the individual rating instruments for each of the five evaluators on the evaluation panel to determine if the panel documented its rationale for awarding a higher rating.

We determined that, for the most part, there were no written comments supporting ratings either on the summaries, or the individual rating instruments. We reviewed the individual rating instruments to determine if the ratings assigned by the evaluation panel members were consistent. We noted that the assigned ratings for a given criteria for a given proposal were generally the same for all five evaluators. Where there were differences, they generally involved panel members assigning the next higher available rating. We noted no instances where the ratings assigned were implausible such as an evaluation criteria being rated Meets Requirements by part of the panel and Does Not Meet Requirements by other member(s) of the panel. Further, where an evaluation criteria was objective, such as a criteria for the number of years a proposer had been in business, we noted that all members of the evaluation panel consistently rated these criteria the same. Finally, we reviewed the work backgrounds of the evaluation panel and determined that all five panel members have experience with Welfare to Work programs. Accordingly, these panel members would be well qualified to evaluate the proposals received in response to the RFP.

We discussed the general absence of supporting written comments with DPSS, who pointed out that there had been a pre-meeting attended by each of the participants of the evaluation panel. At that meeting, each panel member received a copy of the Proposal Evaluation Document and instructions for completing the document were discussed, including a discussion on assigning a rating higher that Meets Requirements, or Qualified. The Department also pointed out that the scores of the

individual evaluators were discussed in a meeting of the evaluation panel members that was overseen by a facilitator from DPSS. In this meeting, each of the panel members indicated the scores they assigned to each of the rating criteria and the reason(s) why they assigned the rating. According to the DPSS facilitator, upon conclusion of this process, there was an open discussion of the panel in which issues such as differences in assigned ratings were discussed.

Conclusion: With respect to the issue of the award of ratings in excess of Meets Requirements or Qualified, DPSS should have taken steps to ensure that the evaluation panel's rationale for assigning a particular rating, or ratings, to a given evaluation criteria was thoroughly documented. However, it appears that the Department did convene an impartial and well qualified evaluation panel that discussed their ratings in an open forum setting and that the panel's ratings were consistent.

Where ACS Lost Points to it Competitors

We have performed an analysis comparing the scores by rating category from the three top rated proposals for Regions I through VI (ACS did not submit a bid for Region VII).

We noted that 60% of the available points were concentrated in the Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing and Cost Proposal sections of the RFP. ACS' proposal was rated third best in the area of "Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing" in all six Regional Service Areas. ACS' Cost Proposal was rated second in four of the six regions and third in the remaining two regions.

Conclusion: The proposals of ACS' competitors were rated superior to ACS' proposal in two rating categories of the RFP where 60% of the total available points were awarded.

Attachment I

Summary of Proposal Evaluation Scores
DPSS Job Readiness and Career Planning Services RFP
Department of Public Social Services

Regional Service Area I

Rating Category	Weight	LACOE Rank	LACOE Score	MAXIMUS Rank	MAXIMUS Score	ACS Rank	ACS Score
Proposer's Background and Experience	25%	1st	99	2nd - tie	90	2nd - tie	90
Proposer's Staffing and Qualifications	15%	1st	142	2nd	126	3rd	125
Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing	30%	1st	260	2nd	240	3rd	222
Proposer's Quality Control	15%	1st	145	2nd	120	3rd	108
CBO Bonus Points	50 points	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50
Criminal History Bonus	15 points		0		0		0
Cost Proposal	30%	2nd	285	1st	295	3rd	252
Total		1st	981	2nd	921	3rd	847

Regional Service Area II

Rating Category	Weight	LACOE Rank	LACOE Score	MAXIMUS Rank	MAXIMUS Score	ACS Rank	ACS Score
Proposer's Background and Experience	25%	1st	99	2nd - tie	90	2nd - tie	90
Proposer's Staffing and Qualifications	15%	1st	142	2nd	126	3rd	125
Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing	30%	1st	260	2nd	240	3rd	222
Proposer's Quality Control	15%	1st	145	2nd	120	3rd	108
CBO Bonus Points	50 points	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50
Criminal History Bonus	15 points		0		0		0
Cost Proposal	30%	3rd	217	1st	295	2nd	224
Total		2nd	913	1st	921	3rd	819

Regional Service Area III

Rating Category	Weight	LACOE Rank	LACOE Score	MAXIMUS Rank	MAXIMUS Score	ACS Rank	ACS Score
Proposer's Background and Experience	25%	1st	99	2nd - tie	90	2nd - tie	90
Proposer's Staffing and Qualifications	15%	1st	142	2nd	126	3rd	125
Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing	30%	1st	272	2nd	251	3rd	231
Proposer's Quality Control	15%	1st	145	2nd	120	3rd	108
CBO Bonus Points	50 points	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50
Criminal History Bonus	15 points		0		0		0
Cost Proposal	30%	3rd	197	1st	300	2nd	214
Total		2nd	905	1st	937	3rd	818

Regional Service Area IV

Rating Category	Weight	LACOE Rank	LACOE Score	MAXIMUS Rank	MAXIMUS Score	ACS Rank	ACS Score
Proposer's Background and Experience	25%	1st	99	2nd - tie	90	2nd - tie	90
Proposer's Staffing and Qualifications	15%	1st	142	2nd	126	3rd	125
Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing	30%	1st	272	2nd	251	3rd	231
Proposer's Quality Control	15%	1st	145	2nd	120	3rd	108
CBO Bonus Points	50 points	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50
Criminal History Bonus	15 points		0		0		0
Cost Proposal	30%	2nd	96	1st	122	3rd	84
Total		1st	804	2nd	759	3rd	688

Regional Service Area V

Rating Category	Weight	LACOE Rank	LACOE Score	MAXIMUS Rank	MAXIMUS Score	ACS Rank	ACS Score
Proposer's Background and Experience	25%	1st	99	2nd - tie	90	2nd - tie	90
Proposer's Staffing and Qualifications	15%	1st	142	2nd	126	3rd	125
Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing	30%	1st	260	2nd	240	3rd	222
Proposer's Quality Control	15%	1st	145	2nd	120	3rd	108
CBO Bonus Points	50 points	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50
Criminal History Bonus	15 points		0		0		0
Cost Proposal	30%	3rd	211	1st	295	2nd	243
Total		2nd	907	1st	921	3rd	838

Regional Service Area VI

Rating Category	Weight	LACOE Rank	LACOE Score	MAXIMUS Rank	MAXIMUS Score	ACS Rank	ACS Score
Proposer's Background and Experience	25%	1st	99	2nd - tie	90	2nd - tie	90
Proposer's Staffing and Qualifications	15%	1st	142	2nd	126	3rd	125
Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing	30%	1st	260	2nd	240	3rd	222
Proposer's Quality Control	15%	1st	145	2nd	120	3rd	108
CBO Bonus Points	50 points	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50
Criminal History Bonus	15 points		0		0		0
Cost Proposal	30%	3rd	198	1st	295	2nd	231
Total		2nd	894	1st	921	3rd	826

Regional Service Area VII

Rating Category	Weight	LACOE Rank	LACOE Score	MAXIMUS Rank	MAXIMUS Score
Proposer's Background and Experience	25%	1st	99	2nd - tie	90
Proposer's Staffing and Qualifications	15%	1st	142	2nd	126
Proposer's Methodology and Approach to Staffing	30%	1st	260	2nd	240
Proposer's Quality Control	15%	1st	145	2nd	120
CBO Bonus Points	50 points	1st - tie	50	1st - tie	50
Criminal History Bonus	15 points		0		0
Cost Proposal	30%	1st	195	2nd	146
Total		1st	891	2nd	772

Attachment II

Schedule of Participants to Line Staff Ratios
For Orientation and Job Search Services

RSA No.	Component	ACS	LACOE	MAXIMUS
I	**Orientation Staff**			
	Administrative Staff	0.35	0.85	0.51
	Line Staff	2.40	2.12	1.10
	Total Staff	2.75	2.97	1.61
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**133.33**	**150.94**	**290.91**
	Job Search Services			
	Administrative Staff	3.67	3.00	2.54
	Line Staff	9.60	4.12	5.90
	Total Staff	13.27	7.12	8.44
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**14.79**	**34.47**	**24.07**
II (1)	**Orientation Staff**			
	Administrative Staff	0.36	0.51	0.59
	Line Staff	2.80	4.09	1.10
	Total Staff	3.16	4.60	1.69
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**87.14**	**59.66**	**221.82**
	Job Search Services			
	Administrative Staff	3.66	2.79	2.45
	Line Staff	10.20	6.09	4.90
	Total Staff	13.86	8.88	7.35
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**10.69**	**17.90**	**22.24**
III (1), (2)	**Orientation Staff**			
	Administrative Staff	0.36	0.91	0.45
	Line Staff	3.80	5.14	1.10
	Total Staff	4.16	6.05	1.55
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**105.00**	**77.63**	**362.73**
	Job Search Services			
	Administrative Staff	4.66	3.41	2.62
	Line Staff	14.20	9.14	6.90
	Total Staff	18.86	12.55	9.52
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**12.46**	**19.37**	**25.65**
IV (2)	**Orientation Staff**			
	Administrative Staff	0.34	1.05	0.37
	Line Staff	3.60	3.19	1.10
	Total Staff	3.94	4.24	1.47
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**146.67**	**165.52**	**480.00**
	Job Search Services			
	Administrative Staff	4.68	4.46	2.74
	Line Staff	15.40	8.19	8.90
	Total Staff	20.08	12.65	11.64
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**15.19**	**28.57**	**26.29**

RSA No.		ACS	LACOE	MAXIMUS
V	**Orientation Staff**			
	Administrative Staff	0.36	1.08	0.66
	Line Staff	3.60	3.70	2.20
	Total Staff	3.96	4.78	2.86
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**154.72**	**150.54**	**253.18**
	Job Search Services			
	Administrative Staff	4.66	4.66	2.47
	Line Staff	13.40	9.70	8.80
	Total Staff	18.06	14.36	11.27
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**18.43**	**25.46**	**28.07**
VI	**Orientation Staff**			
	Administrative Staff	0.36	1.11	0.66
	Line Staff	3.40	3.71	2.20
	Total Staff	3.76	4.82	2.86
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**173.53**	**159.03**	**268.18**
	Job Search Services			
	Administrative Staff	4.66	4.87	2.47
	Line Staff	12.60	10.71	8.80
	Total Staff	17.26	15.58	11.27
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	**20.71**	**24.37**	**29.66**
VII	**Orientation Staff**			
	Administrative Staff		0.45	0.70
	Line Staff		2.05	1.10
	Total Staff		2.50	1.80
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	N/A	**52.20**	**97.27**
	Job Search Services			
	Administrative Staff		1.29	2.32
	Line Staff		3.05	3.90
	Total Staff		4.34	6.22
	Participant to Line Staff Ratio	N/A	**15.74**	**12.31**

(1) - Contractor will be required to operate two separate sites within this region.

(2) - Contractor will be required to operate a traditional 3-week Job Club concurrently with a 5-week Job Club program.