Responses to Written Questions

Request for Proposals: Manufactured Home Community Funding Analysis

Issued: October 30, 2026

Proposals are due on Wednesday, November 4, 2026, at 5:00 PM PDT. All other terms of the RFP remain unchanged except as clarified below.

Scope and Geography

Question 1

What are the three ROC activities referenced in the scope, and are there specific projects or ownership structures we should evaluate?

Response: The three activities are: (1) residents purchasing a manufactured home community and forming a resident-owned cooperative; (2) infrastructure projects within an existing resident-owned community; and (3) adding new manufactured homes on vacant lots in an existing resident-owned community.

The analysis should assume the typical ROC ownership structure, in which residents generally own their homes individually and the cooperative owns the shared land. The analysis is not tied to specific projects; proposers should evaluate the three activities generally.

Question 2

Should the proposal cover only the seven named counties, with the additional counties treated as a separately authorized future phase?

Response: Yes. This engagement covers Fresno, Monterey, San Benito, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Mendocino, and Santa Cruz Counties. The additional counties named in the RFP (Alameda, Contra Costa, Sonoma, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, and Solano) are possible future work and are not part of this scope. Proposers may briefly note how their approach could extend to these counties but should not include them in the fee.

Question 3

Within the seven counties, do you expect an exhaustive review of all HOME Participating Jurisdictions and CDBG grantees, or may the consultant prioritize an agreed subset? Is there an approximate number of jurisdictions you envision?

Response: Proposals should identify all HOME Participating Jurisdictions and CDBG grantees serving the seven counties, including consortia and non-entitlement areas served through state programs, and state their estimated number of jurisdictions as a fee assumption. Early in the engagement, the consultant

and ROC USA will agree on a priority subset for detailed review; proposals should state the maximum number their fee assumes. Separately, for state and local funding sources beyond HOME and CDBG, the consultant and ROC USA will agree on a short list early in the engagement.

Background Materials and Prior Examples

Question 4

What prior eligibility analyses, HUD correspondence, funding applications, or examples of denied funding can ROC USA provide?

Response: After award, ROC USA will share materials that may include prior internal eligibility memos, relevant correspondence with HUD or local jurisdictions, past funding applications, and examples where funding was sought and not awarded. Some materials may be shared in summarized or redacted form. ROC USA staff and technical assistance partners will also provide background on the ROC model and local context.

Question 5

What existing research, eligibility analyses, local-plan reviews, or funding inventories will ROC USA and its partners provide?

Response: See the response to Question 4. ROC USA does not have an existing jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction plan review or funding inventory for the covered counties; proposers should assume this work starts from published sources.

Question 6

Do you have a prior example where HOME or CDBG funds were used to help residents of a manufactured home community purchase their community and govern it as a cooperative?

Response: Yes. HOME funds were used to support a resident purchase of a manufactured home community in New York State. ROC USA will share available details after award.

Proposers are welcome to cite relevant examples from any state in their proposals, including any they have worked on directly.

Federal Eligibility Analysis

Question 7

How detailed should proposed statutory, regulatory, and HUD guidance changes be — recommendations with supporting rationale, or draft amendment language?

Response: Draft language is expected, along with simple explanations of what the changes aim to accomplish. For each statutory or regulatory barrier, the consultant should identify the specific provision and draft a targeted redline. For each HUD policy barrier or gap, the consultant should propose specific revisions to existing guidance or draft language for new guidance, with an explanation of the change needed and why. See also the response to Question 8.

Question 8

For proposed statutory, regulatory, and HUD guidance changes, do you anticipate a consultant's policy analysis and draft language, or formal legal review/opinion? Will ROC USA's counsel or other technical partners be available to review the findings?

Response: ROC USA is seeking policy analysis with citations and draft language (see Question 7), not a formal legal opinion. ROC USA's counsel and/or technical assistance partners will be available to review draft findings.

Plan Language and Advocacy

Question 9

How many Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan templates are required? Should these be broadly adaptable or tailored to individual jurisdictions, and will ROC USA provide preferred formats?

Response: The federal component calls for one set of adaptable Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan language covering each activity found federally permissible. It should include amendment language where useful, eligibility conditions, and brief instructions for local tailoring. This is a common template set, not one per jurisdiction.

Separately, the local component asks for usable language tailored to each jurisdiction or funding source reviewed, where a change is recommended (see Question 10).

ROC USA does not have a required format; editable Word documents are acceptable.

Question 10

For reusable plan language, do you envision a common set of adaptable templates, or separately tailored language for each jurisdiction reviewed? Similarly, should advocacy recommendations address each jurisdiction individually or focus on priority opportunities?

Response: Both, for different deliverables. The federal component calls for a common set of adaptable templates (see Question 9). The local component calls for usable language tailored to each jurisdiction or funding source reviewed, where a change is recommended.

For advocacy, please provide a short, prioritized action list for each jurisdiction or funding source reviewed, with contacts and timing. Proposers may also recommend which opportunities ROC USA should pursue first. ROC USA expects brief, practical guidance rather than a detailed campaign plan for every jurisdiction.

Local Review, Calendar, and Interviews

Question 11

What planning period should the funding calendar cover?

Response: At minimum, the calendar should cover the next Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan cycle for each jurisdiction reviewed, including plan updates, public comment periods, hearings,

amendment opportunities, and funding deadlines. Please distinguish published dates from anticipated timing and include staff contacts and source links.

Question 12

Approximately how many external interviews or agency conversations do you anticipate? Please confirm virtual is acceptable.

Response: The review should rely on existing guidance and relevant examples, with targeted conversations where they would resolve an important question. We expect most conversations will relate to local funding sources. Please state the number of conversations your fee assumes. Virtual interviews and project meetings are preferred.

Team Composition

Question 13

Would ROC USA consider a team combining housing market and feasibility expertise with a specialist in federal HOME/CDBG requirements and California funding programs? Which capabilities must the lead consultant demonstrate directly?

Response: Yes. Teams and subconsultant arrangements are welcome. Proposals should identify key team members and their roles. Relevant experience is scored at 15 points for California experience and 15 points for federal experience, and these may be met by the team as a whole**.** Proposals should make clear which team members bring federal HOME/CDBG regulatory expertise and how they will be involved in the federal analysis.

Schedule, Milestones, and Meetings

Question 14

What is the target completion date? Are there funding or plan adoption deadlines driving the work, and how many meetings or revision rounds should we include?

Response: The anticipated contract start is Monday, December 7, 2026. The work should allow ROC USA to act on upcoming plan cycles in the covered counties. The target completion date is June 7, 2027.

At minimum, there will be a kickoff meeting, a check-in early in the engagement to agree on the list of jurisdictions and funding sources, monthly reviews of draft deliverables, a mid-project review, and a final discussion of findings and next steps with ROC USA staff. We encourage proposals to include other check-ins as desired by the proposal team. See also Question 15.

Question 15

What completion date and interim milestones do you anticipate? How many review rounds and staff presentations should be included?

Response: See the response to Question 14. Interim milestones should include agreement on the list of jurisdictions and funding sources early in the engagement, a draft federal findings memo, a draft local and state review, and final deliverables. At minimum, please assume monthly reviews and at least two presentations on findings to ROC USA staff.

Budget

Question 16

Is there an anticipated budget range, and which outcomes would make this engagement most valuable to ROC USA?

Response: ROC USA's budget for this engagement will not exceed $50,000. Proposals do not need to approach that amount, and lower-cost proposals that fully meet the scope are encouraged. Cost accounts for 20 of 100 evaluation points. Please propose a fixed fee or hourly rates with a not-to-exceed total, broken out by (1) the federal review, plan templates, and federal advocacy, and (2) the local and state review, calendar, and local advocacy, with the key assumptions for each (such as the number of jurisdictions and conversations).

Question 17

Is there an anticipated budget or funding range for this engagement?

Response: See the response to Question 16.

Question 18

Do you have a target budget range?

Response: See the response to Question 16.