



Request for Proposals (RFP)

Jail Medical Care Feasibility Study
RFP # 2025-GSFA-001

Release Date: October 13, 2025

Issued By:
Golden State Finance Authority (GSFA)
1215 K Street, Suite 1650
Sacramento, CA 95814

Responses due: December 12, 2025 @ 5:00pm Pacific Time

Dear Applicant,

The Golden State Finance Authority (GSFA) invites you to submit a proposal to conduct a feasibility study on long-term alternatives for jail medical care across one or more of five identified regions within California. This Request for Proposals (RFP) outlines the requirements for your proposal.

This RFP is part of a competitive process to identify a qualified consultant or team of consultants with expertise in correctional healthcare systems, regional service delivery, and cost-benefit analysis. The selected consultant(s) will evaluate the feasibility of different medical care delivery models across multiple counties and prepare regional reports to inform future local decision-making.

This public process is designed to provide transparency and accountability for participating counties. Following the close of the bidding period, submitted proposals will be reviewed and evaluated according to the criteria outlined in this RFP. Please review the confidentiality provisions carefully and direct any questions to GSFA in advance of submitting any documentation you consider proprietary or confidential.

SUBMISSION DEADLINE:

Interested parties must submit a Notice of Intent to Respond in order to participate in this RFP process. Final proposals must be received by 5:00 P.M. Pacific Time on December 12, 2025. Late submissions will not be considered.

Please direct all questions via email to Jason Hansen (jhansen@rcrcnet.org) and Eric Will (ewill@rcrcnet.org). Answers to all questions will be shared with interested parties by the method and in accordance with the schedule outlined in the RFP.

We look forward to receiving your proposal and working together to explore innovative and sustainable solutions for regional jail medical care in California.

Sincerely,
Patrick Blacklock
Executive Director
Golden State Finance Authority

Table of Contents

1. Background Information	4
1.1 The Entity	4
1.2 The Project	4
2. Key Information.....	6
2.1 Administrative Guidance	6
2.2 Confidentiality.....	6
2.3 Proposal Preparation Costs	7
2.4 Proposal Terms	7
3. Administrative Requirements.....	7
3.1 Legal Requirements and Attestations	8
3.2 Insurance Requirements	8
4. Submission.....	8
4.1 Notice of Intent to Respond.....	9
4.2 Questions.....	9
4.3 Form of Submission	9
4.4 Withdrawal and Resubmission	10
4.5 Irrevocable Offer	10
4.6 Additional Information Requests	10
4.7 Contract Award	10
4.8 RFP Schedule	10
5. Evaluation.....	11
5.1 Point Distribution Matrix.....	11
5.2 Scoring	11
5.3 Minimum Point Threshold.....	12
5.4 Award Determination.....	12
5.5 Rights Conferred.....	12
5.6 Protests.....	12
6. Scope of Work	13
6.1 Administrative Information.....	13
6.2 Regional Needs Assessment.....	14
6.3 Model Evaluation and Comparative Analysis.....	14
6.4 Performance and Compliance Criteria Review	15
6.5 Comparative Cost Summary and Fiscal Considerations	16
6.6 Implementation Roadmap and Risk Considerations	16
6.7 Regional Reporting and Presentation Requirements	17
6.8 Consultant Qualifications and Staffing Plan	17
7. Proposal	18
7.1 Proposal Narrative Format.....	18
7.2 Required Attachments and Documentation	19
EXHIBIT A: Map of Regions and Participating Counties	20

1. Background Information

1.1 The Entity

The Golden State Finance Authority (GSFA) is a duly constituted joint powers authority and public agency established in 1993 under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the California Government Code. GSFA operates governmental programs and projects to promote public safety and economic development, among public purposes.

GSFA's membership is composed of 40 California counties. Each member county appoints one elected Supervisor from its Board of Supervisors to serve on the GSFA Board of Directors, which governs the agency.

GSFA administers a range of programs focused on infrastructure, housing, energy, and public services. As part of its commitment to strengthening service delivery and regional collaboration, GSFA is administering this RFP on behalf of participating counties to evaluate long-term alternatives for the delivery of jail medical care.

In this role, GSFA will serve as the contracting entity, facilitate the evaluation and selection process, and act as the fiscal intermediary for compensating the selected consultant using funds contributed by participating counties.

1.2 The Project

Counties throughout California are increasingly challenged by the rising cost and complexity of providing legally required medical care to individuals in county jails. Many counties are experiencing staffing shortages, rising contract costs, uneven access to behavioral health and specialty services, and difficulty maintaining compliance with state and national care standards. These issues are particularly pronounced in rural and medium-sized counties, where scale, geography, and resource limitations create barriers to service delivery.

In response to these concerns, GSFA has convened five regional task forces composed of County Executive and Administrative Officers (CEOs and CAOs) to explore long-term alternatives for delivering jail medical care. Each task force represents a distinct geographic region of California (See Exhibit A: Map) and includes counties that have expressed interest in exploring regional collaboration as a strategy for improving service delivery, quality of care, and cost-efficiency.

This RFP is being issued to procure a qualified consultant, or team of consultants, to conduct a feasibility study that evaluates alternative models for jail medical care delivery.

The selected consultant(s) will conduct a comprehensive analysis within each of the five regions, including a needs assessment, model evaluation, and cost-benefit analysis. Deliverables will include five distinct regional feasibility reports to support each task force's efforts to make informed decisions about the future of jail medical services in their region.

The overarching goal of this initiative is to identify realistic and sustainable alternatives that improve healthcare outcomes, enhance operational efficiency, and maintain compliance with best

practices and legal mandates. By evaluating the potential for regional coordination, counties aim to leverage shared resources while maintaining local control and accountability.

County Participation and Regional Approach

This feasibility study is being conducted in partnership with counties across five defined regions of California. Each region comprises counties that have voluntarily joined a regional task force convened by GSFA. The counties participating in each task force have expressed a shared interest in exploring regional strategies to improve the delivery, cost-effectiveness, and quality of jail medical care.

The regions and their participating counties are as follows:

- **North State Region:** Del Norte, Humboldt, Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity Counties
- **Bay Area Region:** Napa, Solano, and Sonoma Counties
- **Central Coast Region:** San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties
- **Sacramento/Sierra Region:** Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Lake, Mono, Placer, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties.
- **Central Valley Region:** Fresno, Kings, Madera, and Merced Counties

While counties are grouped regionally to support collaboration and potential shared service models, each county retains full discretion over its participation in future implementation activities. The feasibility study is intended to provide each task force with data-driven insights and practical options tailored to both regional and local contexts.

Respondents to this RFP may submit proposals to serve one or more regions. GSFA encourages submissions from consultants capable of delivering a comprehensive study across all five regions, with pricing and deliverables broken down by region. While preference may be given to respondents capable of completing the full scope of work across all five regions, GSFA reserves the right to award partial proposals, including selecting one or more respondents to serve individual regions. This may include awarding only portions of a proposal or issuing multiple awards across different geographic regions if doing so better serves the needs of participating counties.

The consultant(s) selected through this process will be expected to produce a separate feasibility report for each region, with the flexibility to incorporate any additional county-specific considerations identified by individual task forces.

Current Challenges in Jail Medical Service Delivery

Counties across California are facing a growing set of challenges in delivering mandated medical care to individuals housed in county jails. These challenges vary by jurisdiction but often include common themes such as:

- Staffing shortages
- Escalating contract costs
- Limited access to behavioral health services

- Operational inefficiencies
- Difficulty maintaining compliance with state requirements and national standards
- Increased litigation and liability risks related to inadequate or delayed care
-

2. Key Information

2.1 Administrative Guidance

This RFP is intended to provide interested parties (referred to as "respondents") with sufficient information to prepare and submit a proposal that is responsive to the goals and requirements set forth by GSFA. This RFP is not intended to limit creative solutions or disqualify respondents who may propose innovative approaches to the scope of work. Respondents who believe they can fulfill the objectives of the RFP using alternative methods or models are encouraged to provide clear justification and documentation to support those proposals.

Respondents are advised of the following responsibilities:

- Review the entire contents of this RFP carefully, including all instructions, requirements, and attachments.
- Ensure that all required components of the proposal are completed and submitted by the deadline.
- Submit questions by the specified deadline if clarification is needed regarding any part of the RFP.
- Avoid including conditional statements, assumptions, or exceptions that may conflict with the intent of the RFP.
- Ensure that all information provided is accurate, complete, and appropriately documented.

This procurement process is designed to promote fairness, transparency, and the selection of a qualified consultant(s) that can deliver high-quality work on behalf of participating counties. GSFA reserves the right to modify or cancel any portion of this RFP at any time before contract execution.

2.2 Confidentiality

All submissions, including all supporting documentation, become public after contracts are awarded. GSFA reserves the right to delay release of these records to other bidders or the public until the contract award date.

GSFA is subject to the California Public Records Act (Government Code section 7920.000 et seq.) ("PRA"), which provides public access to all records in GSFA's possession – including submissions for this RFP. Everything submitted to GSFA is presumptively a public record. Such disclosure may be made regardless of whether the proposal (or portions thereof) is marked "confidential," "trade secret," "proprietary," or otherwise, and regardless of any statement in the proposal (a) purporting to limit the GSFA's right to disclose information in the proposal, or (b) requiring GSFA to inform or obtain the consent of the Proposer prior to the disclosure of the proposal (or portions thereof).

Exceptions to disclosure are those parts or portions of a proposal that are justifiably defined as business or trade secrets, as determined by GSFA its sole discretion, and are plainly marked by the Proposer as “confidential,” “trade secret,” or “proprietary.”

GSFA will not, in any way, be liable or responsible for the disclosure of any such record or any parts thereof, if disclosure is required or permitted under the California Public Records Act or otherwise by law, as determined by GSFA in its sole discretion. A blanket statement of confidentiality or the marking of each page of the proposal as confidential will not be deemed sufficient notice of exception. The Proposers must specifically label only those provisions of their respective proposal which are “confidential,” “trade secret,” or “proprietary” in nature.

In the event GSFA is required to defend an action on a Public Records Act request for any of the aforementioned documents, information, books, records, and/or contents of a proposal marked “confidential,” “trade secret,” or “proprietary,” Proposer agrees to defend and indemnify GSFA from all costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, incurred in connection with any action, proceedings, or liability arising in connection with the Public Records Act request.

2.3 Proposal Preparation Costs

GSFA is not liable for any cost incurred by the respondent associated with the preparation of their proposal nor the negotiation of a contract for services prior to the issuing of the contract.

2.4 Proposal Terms

By submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, the respondent agrees to the terms and conditions set forth in this document. Respondents are responsible for understanding all requirements, obligations, and expectations outlined in the RFP, as well as any subsequent addenda issued prior to the final submission deadline.

Submission of a Notice of Intent to Respond is required. Any proposals submitted without such notice may be subject to disqualification or may not be reviewed. It is the responsibility of the respondent to ensure that all required materials, including supplemental documentation, are submitted to GSFA by the final deadline specified in this RFP. Conditional responses may be rejected.

Participation in this RFP process does not create an obligation on the part of GSFA to award a contract. GSFA reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, and to request clarification or additional information from respondents at any point during the review process. GSFA also reserves the right to modify the scope of work, timeline, or evaluation process if it is determined to be in the best interest of the participating counties.

All terms and conditions set forth in this RFP, and any attachments or exhibits, will be incorporated into the final agreement with the selected consultant unless otherwise modified by mutual written agreement. In submitting a bid, Respondent agrees to enter into an agreement on a form prepared by GSFA consistent with the provisions of this RFP.

3. Administrative Requirements

3.1 Legal Requirements and Attestations

Respondents must include the following documentation and attestations as part of their submission:

- **Proof of Legal Entity:** Provide documentation verifying that the respondent is legally authorized to do business in the State of California.
- **Insurance Requirements:** Confirm that the respondent holds, or will obtain prior to contract execution, insurance at the coverage levels described in 3.2, below.
- **Non-Discrimination Assurance:** Certify that the respondent does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, disability, or other legally protected class in employment practices or service delivery.
- **Litigation Disclosure:** Disclose any current or recent litigation or legal claims filed against the respondent or key personnel within the past three years that could affect the organization's capacity to perform the scope of work.
- **Regulatory Compliance:** Attest that the respondent will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations throughout the duration of the contract, including the Public Records Act.
- **Subpoena and Legal Cooperation Clause:** Acknowledge that any materials submitted or communications with GSFA may be subject to subpoena or public records requests, and agree to cooperate fully in any resulting legal or compliance matters.

These requirements are intended to ensure that the selected consultant(s) possess the legal and operational capacity to fulfill the obligations of the contract in a public sector environment.

3.2 Insurance Requirements

A Respondent awarded a contract pursuant to this RFP must take out and maintain during the life of said agreement the following policies of insurance:

1. **Commercial General Liability (CGL):** Coverage on an "occurrence" basis, including products and completed operations, property damage, bodily injury, and personal and advertising injury with limits not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence. If a general aggregate limit applies, either the general aggregate limit shall apply separately to this project/location or the general aggregate limit shall be twice the required occurrence limit.
2. **Automobile Liability:** Coverage for any auto, or if Contractor has no owned autos, covering hired and non-owned autos, with limits not less than \$1,000,000 per accident for bodily injury and property damage.
3. **Workers' Compensation:** as required by the State of California, with Statutory Limits, and Employer's Liability Insurance with limit of no less than \$1,000,000 per accident for bodily injury or disease.
4. **Professional Liability (Errors and Omissions):** Insurance appropriate to the Contractor's profession, with limit no less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence or claim and \$2,000,000 aggregate.

4. Submission

4.1 Notice of Intent to Respond

A notice of intent to submit a proposal, including the name and contact information for a primary contact, must be provided via email to **both** Eric Will (ewill@rcrcnet.org) **and** Jason Hansen (jhansen@rcrcnet.org) by **5:00 P.M. Pacific Time on October 27, 2025**. Any proposals submitted without the respondent providing this notice by the due date may not be considered.

4.2 Questions

Any questions pertaining to the RFP must be submitted via email and can be submitted at any point up to the question deadline: **5:00 P.M. Pacific Time on November 12, 2025**. GSFA shall provide a summary of all questions and GSFA's response to all respondents who have submitted an Intent to Respond after the period for questions has passed. Responses to questions will be issued as an addendum to this RFP and will be a binding component of this RFP.

Respondents requiring clarification on the intent, terms and conditions, content of this RFP, or on procedural matters regarding the competitive bid process may request clarification by submitting questions in writing to GSFA. Respondents must submit all questions via email to **both** Eric Will (ewill@rcrcnet.org) **and** Jason Hansen (jhansen@rcrcnet.org). Only questions submitted in writing to this email address shall be binding and official.

If a respondent who desires clarification or further information on the content of the solicitation, but whose questions relate to the proprietary aspect of its proposal and disclosure exposes its proposal to other bidders, the question may be submitted using the same criteria above with the notation "CONFIDENTIAL." The respondent must explain why the question is sensitive in nature. If GSFA, in its sole discretion, concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose the proprietary nature of the proposal, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be confidentially maintained. If GSFA does not concur with the proprietary aspect of the question, the question and answer will not be confidentially maintained, and the respondent will be notified.

4.3 Form of Submission

The preferred method of submission is email. Electronic submissions should be submitted in a searchable portable document file (PDF) format, though files may also be submitted in their native format for readability, such as Microsoft Excel files for data tables. If a respondent is unable to provide a submission via email due to technical considerations means, they may do so with GSFA's consent and by alternative means acceptable to GSFA.

It is the respondent's responsibility to ensure its proposal is submitted in a manner that enables GSFA to easily locate responses to all requirements in the Scope of Work (see Section 6), descriptions, and supporting documentation.

Final submissions must include a cover letter signed by an individual authorized to bind the respondent's organization contractually. The signature block must indicate the title or position that the individual holds in the organization. An unsigned final proposal may be rejected. Signatures may be scanned copies of wet signatures or digital signatures made consistent with Government Code section 16.5, as interpreted by Chapter 10 of Division 7 of Title 2 of the

California Code of Regulations. Digital signatures created in Adobe software are presumed to comply with this requirement.

A respondent is responsible for ensuring all submission material is submitted by the deadline, whether submitted via email or as hard copy. Please submit applications via email to **both Jason Hansen (jhansen@rcrcnet.org) and Eric Will (ewill@rcrcnet.org)**. For hard copy submissions that have received GSFA's consent, please mail to the following address:

1215 K Street, Suite 1650
Sacramento, CA 95814

4.4 Withdrawal and Resubmission

A respondent may withdraw its final submission at any time prior to the submission deadline, by submitting a written notification of withdrawal via email signed by an authorized representative of the respondent. The respondent may thereafter submit a new or modified proposal prior to the respective submission deadline. Modification offered in any other manner, oral or written, will not be considered. Other than as allowed by law, final proposals cannot be changed or withdrawn after the submission deadline date and time.

4.5 Irrevocable Offer

A respondent's final submission is an irrevocable offer for 60 days from the scheduled contract award date. A respondent may extend the offer in the event of a delay of contract award. Offer extensions must be confirmed in writing via email sent to GSFA signed by an authorized representative of the respondent.

4.6 Additional Information Requests

Prior to the award of contract(s), GSFA must be assured that a selected respondent has the resources to successfully perform under the contract. This includes, but is not limited to, personnel in number and requisite skill; equipment of appropriate type and quantity; financial resources sufficient to complete performance under the contract; and experience in similar endeavors. If, during the evaluation process, GSFA is unable to assure itself of the respondent's ability to perform under the contract if awarded, GSFA has the option of requesting from the respondent any information that GSFA deems necessary to determine the respondent's responsibility. If such information is required, the respondent will be so notified and will be permitted five (5) business days to submit the information requested in writing.

4.7 Contract Award

Contracts are anticipated to be awarded on **January 26, 2026**, but this date is subject to change at GSFA's sole discretion. Should GSFA award the contract at a date following the Bid Irrevocability Period and the selected Proposer opts not to accept the award at that time, GSFA may award the contract to another Proposer, or reject all remaining proposals and reissue the RFP, in its sole discretion.

4.8 RFP Schedule

This RFP follows a 60-day proposal window. Final submissions to this RFP must be submitted via email by 5:00 P.M. Pacific Time on **December 12, 2025**.

RFP Process	Date
RFP issued	October 13, 2025
Deadline to provide notice of intent to respond	October 27, 2025
Deadline for question submissions	November 12, 2025
Deadline for final submissions	December 12, 2025
Anticipated contract award	January 26, 2026
Offer irrevocability period ends	March 27, 2026

5. Evaluation

This section presents the evaluation process and scoring procedures GSFA will follow to evaluate proposals submitted in response to this solicitation. The evaluation process is designed to allow GSFA to determine whether each respondent is responsive and responsible, and which proposal best meets the needs of participating counties and provides the best value overall. A responsive proposal is one that best meets all the requirements set forth in this solicitation.

5.1 Point Distribution Matrix

All proposals will be assigned points according to the following matrix. The matrix identifies each evaluation component, the scoring methodology, and the maximum points available for scored components. Each evaluation component relates to a requirement from this RFP, as noted.

Evaluation Component	Maximum Score
Legal Requirements and Attestations (3.1)	Pass/Fail
Notice of Intent to Respond Submitted (4.1)	Pass/Fail
Submission Validation (4.3)	Pass/Fail
Administrative Information (6.1)	10 Points
Regional Needs Assessment (6.2)	10 Points
Model Evaluation and Comparative Analysis (6.3)	15 Points
Performance and Compliance Criteria Review (6.4)	10 Points
Comparative Cost Summary and Fiscal Considerations (6.5)	10 Points
Implementation Roadmap and Risk Considerations (6.6)	5 Points
Regional Reporting and Presentation Requirements (6.7)	5 Points
Consultant Qualifications and Staffing Plan (6.8)	10 Points
Proposal Narrative Format and Completeness (Section 7)	5 Points
Regional Coverage Incentive (proposal covers multiple regions)	10 Points
Proposal Cost and Fiscal Reasonableness	10 Points
Total Maximum Score	100 Points

5.2 Scoring

GSFA will review each proposal in detail to determine its compliance with the solicitation requirements. GSFA reserves the right to use multiple means to validate and determine the respondent's response to a requirement. This may be through details in its description and/or supporting documentation provided or material that is publicly available, that may either support or contradict the respondent's claim of intended compliance.

5.3 Minimum Point Threshold

A respondent must pass all pass/fail components and score at least 50 points to be awarded a contract. Failure to meet this requirement will disqualify the requester.

5.4 Award Determination

GSFA may award one or more contracts based on the proposals received and the regions proposed to be served. While preference may be given to respondents capable of completing the full scope of work across all five regions, GSFA reserves the right to award partial proposals, including selecting one or more respondents to serve individual regions. This may include awarding only portions of a proposal or issuing multiple awards across different geographic regions if doing so better serves the needs of participating counties.

Contracts will be awarded in descending order of total score, as determined by GSFA, in its sole discretion, through the evaluation process described in Section 6. Proposals must meet all pass/fail criteria and achieve a minimum threshold score to be considered for award.

Respondents should also acknowledge that GSFA may conduct a post-scoring, pre-award negotiation phase with one or more top-ranked proposers. This phase may be utilized to clarify cost proposals, adjust deliverables, or align contractual terms to ensure the final award best meets the needs of participating counties and provides the best value overall.

The final award(s) will also be subject to review and input from participating counties, and may take into account considerations such as regional alignment, cost-effectiveness, consultant availability, and demonstrated understanding of county-specific priorities.

GSFA reserves the right to make no award, to negotiate with one or more respondents, or to reissue the RFP if it determines that doing so is in the best interest of the project or participating counties.

5.5 Rights Conferred

An award under this RFP does not confer any exclusive right to future contracts, project implementation, or continuation beyond the scope of work defined herein. The contract resulting from this RFP shall not establish any claim, interest, or entitlement to future work with GSFA, participating counties, or their affiliates.

GSFA reserves the right to issue additional solicitations, engage other consultants, or modify the project approach at its discretion. Similarly, participating counties retain full authority to pursue separate or alternative strategies based on the findings of the feasibility study.

5.6 Protests

GSFA's Executive Director will make the final decision regarding selection of one or more Proposers and award of contract(s). This determination is final and conclusive. This procurement process does not include any provision to protest either the process or resulting contract award(s). **The venue for any action or proceeding relating to this procurement process will be Sacramento, California.**

All submissions must address each of these requirements and include all requested information. Narrative descriptions must be clear and apply directly to the solicitation requirements. Any documentation necessary to support narrative descriptions must be included in the submission. Any conflicting information may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive and may result in the Bidder being disqualified.

6. Scope of Work

All submissions must address each of these requirements and include all requested information. Narrative descriptions must be clear and apply directly to the solicitation requirements. Any documentation necessary to support narrative descriptions must be included in the submission. Any conflicting information may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive and may result in the Bidder being disqualified.

GSFA may reject any or all proposals and may waive any immaterial deviation or defect in a proposal. GSFA's waiver of any immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation documents or excuse the respondent from full compliance with the solicitation specifications if awarded the contract.

The awarded consultant(s) must complete all work within 12 to 24 months of contract execution, with the exact duration determined by the number of regions covered in the scope of work, unless an extension is approved in writing by GSFA.

6.1 Administrative Information

Respondents must include the following administrative details in their proposal:

- **Primary Contact Information:** Provide the name, title, organization, phone number, and email address for the individual authorized to act on behalf of the respondent.
- **Proposed Project Team:** List all key personnel who will be assigned to the project, including roles and responsibilities. Resumes or bios must be included in an appendix.
- **References:** Provide a minimum of three (3) professional references from prior clients, preferably public sector or corrections-related engagements, who can speak to the respondent's qualifications, performance, and integrity.
- **Regional Coverage:** Indicate the region(s) the respondent is proposing to serve. Respondents may submit a single proposal covering one or more regions, but must provide distinct cost estimates and work plans for each.
- **Project Management Approach:** Include a brief description of how the respondent will manage communications, timeline tracking, and quality control.

Respondents should also acknowledge their understanding that GSFA will serve as the contract administrator and fiscal agent, but that project funding will be provided by participating counties. All work and deliverables must be completed in coordination with GSFA and designated points of contact within each regional task force.

6.2 Regional Needs Assessment

The selected consultant will be responsible for conducting a comprehensive needs assessment within each of the covered regions. This task will involve gathering and synthesizing information from participating counties to understand the current landscape of jail medical care delivery, including the structure, scope and performance of existing arrangements.

At a minimum, the needs assessment must include the following elements:

- **Inventory of Existing Service Models:** Identify and describe the current medical care delivery approach used in each participating county.
- **Contractual and Operational Overview:** Collect and summarize available data on existing contracts (where applicable), including service providers, contract scope, staffing levels, performance metrics, costs, and renewal timelines. Consultants are expected to engage with county staff to obtain this information, subject to confidentiality limitations.
- **Identification of Shared Challenges and Gaps:** Document common operational or systemic challenges faced by counties in the region, including but not limited to workforce shortages, limited behavioral health coverage, inconsistent service levels, or difficulties with care coordination and compliance.
- **Stakeholder Engagement Summary:** Summarize findings from interviews or meetings with county representatives, jail administrators, health services staff, and other key stakeholders. The consultant is expected to work collaboratively with each regional task force to schedule and conduct these engagements.

The needs assessment must be tailored to each region and reflect both individual county conditions and collective trends. The findings will form the basis for the subsequent comparative model evaluation and recommendations.

6.3 Model Evaluation and Comparative Analysis

Based on the findings of the regional needs assessment, the consultant will evaluate the feasibility, strengths, and limitations of multiple models for jail medical care delivery. At a minimum, this evaluation must include the following three core models:

1. **County-Operated (In-House) Model**
2. **Contracted Medical Services Model**
3. **Regional Joint Powers Authority (JPA) or Shared Contract Administration Model**
 - Under a JPA, service delivery could include the direct provision of medical services by the JPA entity itself, or a shared administrative structure focused on regional contract procurement, vendor oversight, and performance monitoring.

Respondents are encouraged to evaluate additional models or hybrid approaches, particularly if informed by regional conditions, stakeholder feedback, or innovations in correctional healthcare delivery.

The consultant must assess each model across a consistent set of criteria, tailored to the needs of each region. At a minimum, the evaluation should include the following elements:

- **Operational Feasibility:** Evaluate whether each model can be implemented in the context of the region's current capacity, staffing, administrative infrastructure, and geographic characteristics.

- **Staffing and Workforce Considerations:** Assess the viability of recruiting, retaining, and managing appropriate clinical and administrative personnel under each model, including the potential for shared or pooled staffing in regional approaches.
- **Legal and Governance Frameworks:** Identify the legal authorities, liabilities, and governance structures associated with each model. For the JPA or shared services model, describe the required legal steps and institutional agreements needed for implementation.
- **Administrative Complexity and Oversight Requirements:** Compare the level of administrative effort, oversight, and inter-agency coordination required for each model. Highlight where resource or capacity gaps may exist.
- **Scalability and Flexibility:** Evaluate how adaptable each model would be to changes in jail population, medical needs, or funding availability.
- **Alignment with County Preferences:** To the extent possible, reflect the perspectives of participating counties regarding their interest in or concerns about each model, based on stakeholder input collected during the engagement process.

The consultant will be expected to provide a side-by-side comparative analysis of the selected models, supported by qualitative findings and, where appropriate, quantitative indicators. This comparative framework will serve as the foundation for the cost-benefit analysis and implementation planning to follow.

6.4 Performance and Compliance Criteria Review

The consultant will assess the ability of each proposed service delivery model to meet established standards of care and comply with relevant regulatory requirements. This includes evaluating how each model supports the delivery of safe, high-quality, and legally compliant jail medical services.

At a minimum, the consultant must review each model's potential to satisfy the following performance and compliance criteria:

- **Standards of Care Compliance:** Assess each model's potential to support the development and maintenance of a jail medical care system that meets accreditation standards established by nationally recognized entities, such as the National Commission on Correctional Health Care (NCCCHC). Evaluation should also include compliance with applicable California regulations governing medical and behavioral health services in county detention settings. Applicable standards will vary based on local policies and/or federal consent decrees. Consultants must work with each participating county to ascertain local standards, and every proposed model must demonstrate how it will meet these requirements.
- **Staffing Ratios and Coverage:** Assess each model's capacity to meet minimum staffing expectations based on average daily jail population and patient acuity. This includes primary care, behavioral health, dental, and nursing coverage, as well as provisions for 24/7 on-call or in-facility care.
- **Range of Required Services**
Determine whether each model can deliver or coordinate access to a full continuum of care, including at a minimum but not limited to:
 - Primary and urgent medical care
 - Behavioral health services (including 24/7 response where applicable)

- Dental services
- Medication management
- Telehealth capabilities
- Specialty referrals and off-site transport coordination
- Medication Assisted Treatment
- **Continuity and Quality Assurance:** Examine the systems and policies within each model for medical recordkeeping, care continuity (including during intake and release), patient complaint resolution, and ongoing quality assurance. Assess how oversight responsibilities would be structured, particularly in shared or regional models.
- **Risk Mitigation and Liability Management:** Review how each model mitigates risks related to inadequate care, delayed treatment, staffing failures, and non-compliance with court mandates or legal settlements. This includes consideration of potential exposure to litigation and the capacity for effective monitoring and intervention.

This review should be completed for each region independently, informed by the findings of the needs assessment and with attention to the practical realities of implementation. Where possible, the consultant should provide examples or benchmarks from comparable counties or jurisdictions.

6.5 Comparative Cost Summary and Fiscal Considerations

The consultant will develop a high-level comparative summary of the estimated costs and fiscal implications of each service delivery model evaluated. This summary should consolidate relevant financial insights from the needs assessment, model analysis, and performance review to support county decision-making.

At a minimum, the summary must include:

- **Estimated Cost Ranges by Model:** Provide cost estimates for implementation and ongoing operations, including where applicable, startup costs, staffing expenses, administrative overhead, and infrastructure needs. Estimates should be provided for each region individually.
- **Potential Cost Efficiencies or Shared Savings:** Highlight areas where regional or shared service models may yield cost savings through economies of scale, shared staffing, or streamlined administration.
- **Cost-Sharing Considerations:** Outline possible frameworks for apportioning costs among participating counties, including equal-share or population-based models. Identify any region-specific constraints or opportunities.
- **Funding and Sustainability Notes:** Identify potential funding mechanisms that could support implementation.

6.6 Implementation Roadmap and Risk Considerations

The consultant will develop an implementation roadmap for the recommended service delivery model(s) in each region, offering a practical pathway for counties to move from current conditions to the selected future state. This roadmap should account for the varying levels of readiness among participating counties and reflect the administrative, operational, and legal steps required to transition to a new model.

Each roadmap should include a proposed timeline that outlines major milestones, including planning, procurement, contract development, staffing and onboarding, service startup, and evaluation checkpoints. The timeline should clearly distinguish between tasks that are region-wide and those that must be completed by individual counties.

In addition to sequencing, the roadmap must highlight key risks that could delay or compromise implementation. These may include regulatory delays, labor shortages, inter-county coordination challenges, liability concerns, or resistance to operational change. For each identified risk, the consultant should recommend mitigation strategies that counties may adopt during planning and early execution phases.

This section is intended to translate analysis into action. By providing a practical, region-specific guide to implementation, the consultant will help ensure that recommendations can be realistically pursued and sustained over time. The implementation roadmap and any associated recommendations are advisory only. Deliverables intend to inform future policy officials by county officials.

6.7 Regional Reporting and Presentation Requirements

The consultant will be required to deliver a final report for each participating region, summarizing all findings, analyses, and recommendations as outlined in this Scope of Work. Each report must be tailored to the specific conditions, needs, and stakeholder input of the region and must be formatted to support use by county administrative officers, boards of supervisors, and other relevant local decision-makers.

In addition to the written deliverables, the consultant will be expected to present the findings of each regional study to the respective task force in a formal meeting setting. Presentations should highlight key takeaways from the needs assessment, comparative model analysis, cost and compliance findings, and implementation roadmap. The consultant must be prepared to respond to clarifying questions and discuss options or considerations that may not be captured fully in the written report.

To support regional alignment and transparency, each report should also include an executive summary, visual aids such as comparison tables or graphics, and appendices for any technical or background materials. The consultant should work with GSFA and county liaisons to ensure that each region has the opportunity to request refinements, offer feedback, or flag any region-specific issues for clarification prior to final submission. Final regional reports, presentations, and supporting materials will present findings and recommendations for consideration by County Administrative/Executive Officers and Boards of Supervisors. Recommendations are non-binding and are intended to support informed decision-making.

6.8 Consultant Qualifications and Staffing Plan

Respondents must demonstrate that they possess the expertise, organizational capacity, and professional experience necessary to complete the scope of work across multiple counties and regions. Proposals must include a staffing plan that identifies the personnel who will be assigned to the project and describes their roles, qualifications, and availability.

At a minimum, the consultant team must include personnel with expertise in correctional health care systems, public sector procurement and contracting, and regional service delivery models. Experience working with California counties, particularly in the areas of jail operations, medical care, behavioral health, or intergovernmental collaboration, is strongly preferred.

The staffing plan must identify the lead project manager and any subject matter experts or support staff who will be regularly engaged in the work. For each individual, include a brief summary of qualifications and describe their specific role in executing the scope of work. Resumes or professional bios should be provided in an appendix.

Respondents must also confirm their availability to support the project over the anticipated duration, including participation in regional meetings, stakeholder engagements, and presentation of findings. If subcontractors or partner firms will be used, clearly indicate their roles and the nature of the relationship with the lead consultant.

Proposals will be evaluated on both the strength of the team's qualifications and the feasibility of the staffing plan in delivering timely, high-quality work across all participating regions.

7. Proposal

7.1 Proposal Narrative Format

Respondents must submit a clearly written and well-organized proposal narrative that addresses all elements outlined in this RFP. The proposal must follow the structure and content requirements specified below to facilitate consistent review and evaluation.

The narrative portion of the proposal must be organized using the following section headers and sequence:

1. **Cover Letter and Executive Summary**
A signed letter from an authorized representative summarizing the respondent's interest, qualifications, and the regions proposed to be served.
2. **Administrative Information and Contact Details**
Identification of the primary contact, project team members, organizational background, and legal entity status.
3. **Staffing Plan and Key Personnel**
Description of project roles, personnel assignments, qualifications, and availability, with supporting resumes or bios included as appendices.
4. **Technical Approach to Scope of Work**
A comprehensive narrative describing how the respondent will fulfill each component of the Scope of Work, including methods, tools, and timeline assumptions.
5. **Experience and References**
Overview of the respondent's relevant experience, especially with public sector clients or correctional health care projects, and at least three references.
6. **Cost Proposal**
A detailed cost breakdown for each region proposed, including direct and indirect costs, estimated hours, labor rates, and assumptions.

7. Attachments and Supporting Materials

Any additional documentation relevant to the proposal, including personnel resumes, proof of insurance, litigation disclosures, and required attestations. See section 7.2 for more details.

The narrative should not exceed 30 pages, excluding appendices and attachments. Proposals must be submitted in PDF format, with clearly labeled sections and consistent pagination. Font size should be no smaller than 11-point, and margins must be at least one inch on all sides. Failure to follow this required format may result in disqualification or reduced scoring during the evaluation process.

7.2 Required Attachments and Documentation

To be considered responsive, all proposals must include the following attachments and supporting documentation. These materials will be used to verify eligibility, assess capacity, and support the scoring of narrative responses:

1. Resumes or Biographies of Key Personnel

Provide current resumes or professional bios for all individuals identified in the staffing plan. Each document should clearly indicate the person's role on this project and highlight relevant experience in correctional health care, regional planning, or public sector consulting, including dates engaged in relevant activities.

2. Proof of Legal Entity and Business Status

Submit documentation confirming the respondent's legal status and ability to operate in California, such as articles of incorporation, business license, or a certificate of good standing.

3. Certificate of Insurance

Include documentation demonstrating current insurance coverage as required by Section 3.2.

4. Non-Discrimination Policy

Attach the respondent's equal employment opportunity or a signed statement affirming nondiscrimination in hiring and service delivery practices.

5. Litigation Disclosure

Provide a summary of any ongoing or recent litigation involving the respondent or key personnel that may be relevant to the project performance or contracting eligibility.

6. Three (3) Professional References

Include the name, title, organization, phone number, and email address for each reference, along with a brief description of the work performed. At least one reference should be from a public sector client.


7. Cost Proposal and Budget Detail

Attach a budget document outlining the total proposed cost, broken down by region (if applicable), with detailed line items for personnel, travel, indirect costs, and any subcontracted work. Each cost proposal should clearly match the narrative description of work plans.

8. Signed Attestation of Regulatory Compliance

Include a signed statement attesting that the respondent will comply with all applicable local, state, and federal laws, including the California Public Records Act.

EXHIBIT A: Map of Regions and Participating Counties



**Request for Proposals No. 2025-GSFA-001
for
Jail Medical Care Feasibility Study**

**Addendum #1
Issued Tuesday, November 18, 2025**

This addendum provides answers to questions received by potential respondents.

The question period concluded on Wednesday, November 12, 2025, at 5:00pm Pacific Time. The proposal submission deadline remains December 12, 2025, at 5:00 Pacific Time.

Responses to Questions

- 1. The RFP instructs that proposals include a breakdown of direct and indirect costs. Please confirm whether fully burdened labor category billing rates may be used, and that indirect costs are not required if they are included within the fully burdened labor category billing rates. If a proposal is submitted with fully burdened labor category billing rates (inclusive of all indirect costs) and do not list indirect costs separately, would that cause the proposal to be given a lower score or be disqualified?**

Fully burdened billing rates that include indirect costs may be used. It will be helpful for reviewers to state in the cost proposal that fully burdened billing rates are being used to clarify why the indirect cost line item is blank. A proposal that is submitted with fully burdened labor category billing rates will not be a basis for a lower score or disqualification.

- 2. How many county jails by region are to be covered by this project?**

During the Regional Needs Assessment (Section 6.2 of the RFP), the selected Consultant(s) will coordinate directly with each participating county to verify and document the current correctional health infrastructure within each region. This will include confirming the number and type of facilities in operation and the structure of service delivery at each site.

- 3. Does the project cover juvenile as well as adult incarcerated populations?**

It is the intention of this feasibility study to cover adult incarcerated populations housed in county jails. However, respondents may include an

estimated cost breakdown for including juvenile facilities in their proposal, without penalty to their score. In Section 5.4 – Award Determination of the RFP, it is stated:

“Respondents should also acknowledge that GSFA may conduct a post-scoring, pre-award negotiation phase with one or more top-ranked proposers. This phase may be utilized to clarify cost proposals, adjust deliverables, or align contractual terms to ensure the final award best meets the needs of participating counties and provides the best value overall.

The final award(s) will also be subject to review and input from participating counties, and may take into account considerations such as regional alignment, cost-effectiveness, consultant availability, and demonstrated understanding of county-specific priorities.”

The final scope of work will be determined during the post-scoring and pre-award contract negotiation phase, and the inclusion of optional components in a proposal could provide flexibility for the possible inclusion of such components in a contract.

4. Is there a preliminary assessment of total project cost and budget?

There is no preliminary assessment of total project cost and budget.

5. Is there a not to exceed amount for this project?

There is no established not to exceed amount for this project.

6. Do final reports need branding? If so, what branding will be expected?

For each separate feasibility report, the cover page will indicate the region that is included in the study as well as the consulting firm that prepared the report. It is anticipated that the report will use the consultant’s branding, but that is subject to negotiation during the contract award that will involve input by the counties within the region(s). GSFA branding will not be included in any final deliverable.

7. Which entity will be the primary contact throughout the engagement?

GSFA personnel will coordinate the early stages of the contract, facilitating meetings between the Regional Task Forces and Consultant(s). During these initial meetings, it is expected that each participating county assigns a point of contact person that will communicate directly with Consultant(s) throughout the engagement. GSFA will maintain active communication with

each Regional Task Force and Consultant(s) to ensure strong collaboration and can convene all parties at any time throughout the engagement.

GSFA will serve as the contracting entity, facilitate the evaluation and selection process, and act as the fiscal intermediary for compensating the selected consultant using funds contributed by participating counties for the duration of the project.

8. As staffing and workforce considerations are listed, would we include staff training?

Yes. Respondents may include staff training considerations in their proposed approach where relevant, including as part of the model evaluation (Section 6.3 of RFP) and implementation roadmap (Section 6.6 of RFP). However, the design and delivery of actual staff training is not part of the Scope of Work for this project. If respondents choose to discuss potential training needs or future training options, those elements should be clearly described as recommendations and, if costed, identified separately in the cost proposal.

9. What is the time frame for the cost-benefit analysis? Does it include longer term benefits (e.g. better behavioral health care leads to lower recidivism)?

The RFP does not prescribe a specific time frame. Respondents should propose a reasonable timeframe (e.g., short- to medium-term) for their cost-benefit analysis and may also discuss longer-term benefits qualitatively where appropriate (such as potential impacts on recidivism). Assumptions about timeframes should be clearly stated in the proposal. Timeframes may be considered as a component of scoring and in evaluation of whether and to whom to award contracts.

10. How often do each of the five regional task forces meet? Is there a regular schedule for the regional task force meetings and where can we locate?

There is no single, standardized meeting schedule across all regional task forces. Meeting frequency varies by region and over time. During the engagement, the selected Consultant(s) will coordinate with GSFA and regional points of contact to determine a healthy cadence of meetings and check-ins, or to convene meetings as needed.

11. Will the final presentation include all regions or are five final presentations expected?

Five final presentations are expected—one for each region—along with five separate regional feasibility reports, as described in Section 6.7 of RFP.

12. Would you prefer the final presentations occur in-person or virtually?

This will be determined at a later date by each regional task force in consultation with the selected Consultant(s). Respondents may make reasonable assumptions for budgeting purposes and should document those assumptions in their proposals.

13. Is there an expectation for site visits in each of the jails?

The RFP does not mandate site visits to every facility. Respondents may propose site visits where they believe such visits are necessary or add value to the Regional Needs Assessment (Section 6.2 of RFP), recognizing that access is subject to county approval and security protocols. Any proposed site visit strategy and associated costs should be clearly described in the work plan and cost proposal.

14. How will the analysis account for contracts that are owned by the Sheriff and include juvenile facilities?

As noted in Question 3, the primary focus of this feasibility study is adult populations housed in county jails. Where a county has a combined contract that includes both adult and juvenile populations, the selected Consultant(s) will document those arrangements as part of the Regional Needs Assessment and cost analysis (Sections 6.2 and 6.5 of the RFP). While the study's deliverables are focused on adult facilities, information gathered and recommendations made may ultimately impact both adult and juvenile populations, particularly in counties where a single provider serves both settings.

15. Will you allow a phased model, allowing the winning bidder to work with regions in a sequenced manner?

GSFA's preference is for all regions to undergo the feasibility study during the overall project period. However, a phased or sequenced approach may be proposed if it is clearly justified based on resource constraints and if it ensures that all participating counties in all regions are included within the agreed contract timeframe. Any proposed phasing should be explicitly described in the work plan and schedule.

16. Are you interested in a flat fee, deliverables based or time and expense-based proposal?

GSFA does not prescribe a single required billing structure. Respondents may propose a flat fee, deliverables-based, time-and-expense, or hybrid approach, provided the structure is clearly explained, tied to the Scope of Work, and broken down by region as required in the cost proposal. Proposals will be evaluated on clarity, fiscal reasonableness, and alignment with the RFP.

17. Could you provide insight as to how the regions and the counties were selected for participation?

The five regions reflect existing regional task forces convened by GSFA and participating counties that expressed interest in jointly exploring long-term alternatives for jail medical care. Counties were grouped based on geography, existing relationships, and an interest in assessing potential regional or shared service models, as described in Section 1.2 of RFP (County Participation and Regional Approach). Regional task forces are led by county CAOs/CEOs.

18. For each covered region, please provide: a list of the facility names to be included in this project, facility address, capacity, and Average Daily Population (ADP).

As part of the Regional Needs Assessment (Section 6.2 of RFP), the selected Consultant(s) will work with each county to develop and verify a facility inventory and associated data, using available county records and state sources.

19. Does each facility have intake? If a facility does not have intake, where/how is intake performed?

Intake practices vary by county and facility. The selected Consultant(s) will document intake arrangements as part of the Regional Needs Assessment in coordination with county staff and jail administrators.

20. Are any of the covered counties housing incarcerated people from neighboring counties or other agencies under contract agreements?

Some participating counties may have such housing arrangements. Any cross-jurisdictional housing arrangements will be identified documented by the selected Consultant(s) during the Regional Needs Assessment (Section 6.2 of RFP).

21. Are any of the covered facilities being used for Federal holding?

Where this is applicable, it will be identified through county interviews and document review as part of the Regional Needs Assessment and model evaluation.

22. Are any of the facilities included currently under a consent decree, settlement agreement, or other judicial requirements for health services related issues? If so, please list the facilities subject to judicial requirements.

As part of the Performance and Compliance Criteria Review (Section 6.4 of RFP), the selected Consultant(s) will work with counties to identify any such requirements and incorporate them into the analysis where relevant.

23. Have any of the counties or facilities not met the California Title 15 requirements in any of the past 3 years. If so, please list the counties/facilities not in compliance and to which year(s) this applies.

The selected Consultant(s) are expected to review publicly available information and county-provided materials, and to incorporate any known compliance issues into the Performance and Compliance Criteria Review (Section 6.4 of RFP).

24. Please provide additional details regarding the current delivery of health care services. Is the current health care delivery model determined on a facility-by-facility basis? On a county-by-county basis?

Current delivery models vary across and within regions. In some cases, arrangements are county-wide; in others, facility-specific factors may shape service delivery. A primary purpose of the Regional Needs Assessment (Section 6.2 of RFP) is to perform inventory and describe existing service models in each participating county.

25. By region, what percentage (approximately) of health care is delivered by an outside vendor? By the county? In a shared arrangement?

Developing this summary is part of the Scope of Work. The selected Consultant(s) will quantify and describe these arrangements as part of the Regional Needs Assessment and Model Evaluation (Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of RFP).

26. In general, is medical and mental health care provided in the same manner (ex. both are provided by the same vendor, or both are provided by the county), or is care delivered differently for medical and mental health (ex. medical is provided by a vendor and mental health provided

by the county, or medical and mental health care is provided by different vendors)?

Service configurations differ by county. In some jurisdictions, medical and mental health services may be integrated under one provider; in others, they may be separated between county departments and/or vendors. The RFP anticipates that the selected Consultant(s) will document these arrangements during the Regional Needs Assessment and incorporate them into the comparative analysis (Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of RFP).

27. Are any of the facilities currently accredited by the National Commission on Correctional Health Care and/or the American Correctional Association? If so, please provide a list including the facility name and related accreditation.

Accreditation status, where relevant, will be identified and incorporated into the Performance and Compliance Criteria Review (Section 6.4 of RFP) by the selected Consultant(s) in collaboration with participating counties.