



State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387

July 25, 2016

ADDENDUM #2

RFP: 7550738

Title: Regional Prevention Task Forces

Bid Closing Date & Time: September 30, 2016 at 10:00 AM (Eastern Time)

Notice to Vendors

ATTACHED ARE VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES. NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.

ALSO, PLEASE SEE ATTACHED REVISED APPENDIX IV: RHODE ISLAND POPULATION

David J. Francis
Interdepartmental Project Manager

Interested parties should monitor this website, on a regular basis, for any additional information that may be posted.

BHDDH Response Vendor Questions with Response for RFP #7550738 Regional Prevention Task Forces

Question 1: I have a question regarding the #7550738 RFP regarding the regionalization of the municipal prevention task forces. The document infers that it has regarded regional school districts, yet in identifying communities for South County (Region #7) and Newport County (Region #6), they place Jamestown in Newport County yet its high school students attend either North Kingstown or Narragansett High Schools. That poses a significant problem in the planning. Can you tell me if there will be a consideration to change the regions, with this in mind?

Answer to question 1: BHDDH will require that Region 7 and Region 6 collaborate in the planning and delivery of services impacting Jamestown High School students. There will not be any change to Regions 7 and 6 at this time. Region 7 may request additional funds to serve the number of Jamestown students in attendance at North Kingstown or Narragansett High Schools based on actual enrollment data from the respective school district. Region 6 must agree, at the time of contracting, to a reduction of the equivalent amount of funds. Alternatively, Region 7 and Region 6 may enter into a formal agreement such as a Memorandum of Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding to exchange funds to serve those Jamestown youth who attend schools in Region 7.

Question 2: On page 17, the RFP states a maximum funding award of \$150,000 for Providence and states that as a single-municipality region, Providence (region 3) will not be eligible to request funding for a regional coordinator. However, on page 50, the total budget for Region 3 is noted as \$252,819.64, with administrative funding of \$25,281.96. Can you clarify the total amount an application for Region 3 can request?

Answer to question 2: Region 3 may request \$150,000. The total administrative cost cannot exceed \$15,000 and is included within the \$150,000 budget. The administrative amount named on page 50 was an error. Because Region 3 is a single municipality and not a region, the municipal award is capped at \$150,000.

Question 3: Are administrative 10% totals above and beyond the grant request totals on page 50, or included in the total? How does this apply to region 3 specifically?

Answer to question 3: The administrative totals are expressed as 10% of available funds based on the 1.42/per person formula based on population within the entirety of the region (e.g., all the municipalities that comprise the region). However, Region 3 is a single municipality and not a region, the municipal award is capped at \$150,000, including up to \$15,000 in administrative costs. Please see attached, revised Appendix IV Rhode Island Population.

Question 4: Is there a page limit or recommended page length for the technical proposal? Is there any required formatting in terms of font, margins, etc for the technical proposal?

Answer to question 4: There are no set page limits for the technical proposal. Please use 12 point font with 1” standard margins and be sure to number pages and any appendices submitted. No specific font is required.

Question 5: Do the decreases of 10% per year noted on page 15 apply to the Providence award, or do they apply to the Providence total on page 50? In other words, if Providence is entitled by population to \$252k but limited as all municipalities to \$150k, will Providence’s grant drop to \$135k in year 2, etc, or will the total it is eligible for notwithstanding the individual municipal cap drop from the \$252k by ten percent per year, meaning no actual change until the population based total gets below \$150k?

Answer to question 5: The step down in the municipal coordinator’s salary does not apply to Region 3 (Providence) because it is not a Regional Coalition and will not have the ability to realize any cost savings due to economies of scale. There will also be no incentive fund to manage.

Question 6: In two places on page 6, the RFP states that five of the six CSAP prevention strategies must be addressed. However, on page 11, it states that four of the six must be addressed. Can you clarify which guidance is correct?

Answer to question 6: The approach described within this RFA is intended to insure coverage of five (5) of the six (6) Center for Substance Abuse prevention strategies STATEWIDE as a current BHDDH contract provides coverage of problem identification and referral. Each region must cover four (4) of the remaining five (5) strategies which include community based process, alternatives, education and environmental change and address these in the regional plan submitted (see RFP, p.11).

Question 7: To what extent should the work plan provided in the technical proposal lay out specific proposed implementation strategies, for months 7-12, as opposed to laying out broad and general strategies for which specifics would be driven by results of the needs assessment in months 1-6?

Answer to question 7: The technical proposal should describe the process for assessing need, building capacity, planning and implementing needed capacity building and evidence based practices policies, programs or practices (EBPs) within the region and within the municipalities that comprise the regional membership, and participation in the evaluation with a contracted state evaluator. Specific EBPs should not be named in the technical proposal as they should be determined based on the assessment and planning process post-award.

Question 8: Should the cost proposal assume specific interventions and strategies for months 7-12, even though those may need to be adjusted based on the needs assessment? Or should

the parts of the budget associated with specific intervention expenses be very general at this point?

Answer to question 8: The cost proposal should assume that there will be costs associated with the implementation of specific interventions and strategies in months 7-12 but may be very general at this point as the specific interventions will not be selected until the regional and municipal planning processes are completed. These can be considered a funding pool and should be considered to be the funds available for implementation post-planning

Question 9: The Regional Prevention Task Force RFP was released on June 27, 2016 with a submission date of August 5, 2016. Whereas, Coalitions wishing to respond to the RFP are required to cooperate and collaborate with their local municipalities the six week turnaround for the application to be submitted to the State of RI places undo burden on the coalitions. Coalitions who seek to have their municipalities serve as fiscal agent will need time to have their request placed on the town council's agenda and will need to seek the approval of the collaborating communities.

Is there a possibility of a change in deadline for submission to September 2016 in order for coalitions to secure municipal agreements?

Answer to question 9: Addendum 1 has been posted for RFP 7550738 Regional Prevention Task Forces and can be found here:
[http://www.purchasing.ri.gov/bidding/BidDocuments.aspx?BidNumber=7550738&Isridot=False&Status=Active\(Scheduled\)](http://www.purchasing.ri.gov/bidding/BidDocuments.aspx?BidNumber=7550738&Isridot=False&Status=Active(Scheduled)).

Addendum 1 revises the submission deadline from 8/5/2016 at 10:00 AM (ET) to 9/30/2016 at 10:00 AM (ET).

Question 10: On page 16, Section 4: Technical Proposal, #2: Is the "Offeror" required to be a 501 C 3?

Answer to question 10: Eligible applicants for this procurement are community-based, non-profit organizations, charitable organizations, units of local government, and private and public colleges and universities. For profit organizations are not eligible to receive funding through this procurement. (RFP, p. 7)

Question 11: On page 15, there is an explanation of the proposed year 2 – 10% step down from the base year. With the understanding that this is all based on availability of funding, will the 10% step down be a reduction of funding for the yearly overall budget for the regional coalition or a 10% reduction within the regional budget to reflect the 10% reduction in salary for the municipal coordinator?

Answer to question 11: The ten percent (10%) reduction in these funds (SAMHSA Substance Abuse Block Grant {SABG} Prevention Set-Aside) will apply to salary for the municipal coordinator only. The Regional Coalition Coordinator will be responsible for assisting the municipal coordinator in development of a multi-year funds development plan to identify alternative funding sources for 10% loss of salary commencing in year 2. Funds freed up from the coordinator salary will go back into the municipal funding pool to be used for services within the municipality. For example, if a municipal coordinator receives a salary of \$20,000 in year 1 which will be reduced to \$18,000 in year 2. The funds development plan may identify fundraisers as a source of \$1,000 and the Rotary or Chamber of Commerce as the source of the additional \$1,000. The \$2,000 saved from municipal coordinator salary could then be used to purchase a school based curriculum for behavioral health promotion for the elementary school. In year 3, the municipal coordinator salary will be reduced by another 10% from their SABG funds reducing that funding stream to \$16,200 (\$1,800=10% of \$18,000) and the multi-year funds development plan would anticipate the need to identify another funding source for \$1,800 which may then be submitting a grant application to a local hospital or family foundation.

Question 12: On page 12, there is a requirement outlined about the RISS. Will this requirement include annual or bi-annual administration of the RISS?

Answer to question 12: The RISS will be a bi-annual, on-line administration with a paper option. These costs will not be incurred until 2018.

Question 13: On page 10, there is a sentence, "Each Regional Prevention Coalition will set aside a percentage of their direct cost budget to manage a performance-based incentive fund for municipal members." Can this be elaborated upon for more clarity?

Answer to question 13: The specific terms related to issuance of incentives will be determined by the department. This does not apply to Region 3 since it is a single municipality. The following are examples provided in the RFP: Municipal coalitions may receive an enhancement/increase to their annual award if they exceed performance measures related to: timeliness of data entry into Mosaix IMPACT, saturation of CSAP strategies within the municipality, number of schools within a school district that participate in the RI Student Survey, and percentage of municipal coordinators who attain and maintain prevention certification. An additional incentive would be provided directly to the regional coordinator if certification at the level of Certified Prevention Specialist Supervisor is attained and maintained for the duration of the contract if funding for this incentive is available and approved by the Department of Purchasing. Issuance of these incentives will take place during the contract year but not later than third quarter and must be approved by the department (RFP, p. 17).

Question 14: When looking at the RFP I need the amounts clarified per region.

For example: Is the East Bay region eligible for \$150,000. plus \$137,615.04 or just the \$137,615.04?

Answer to question 14: The East Bay region would be eligible for the \$137,615.04 which includes the administrative fee which cannot exceed 10% or 13,761.50.

Question 15: Can the position of Regional Prevention Coordinator be shared by two staff person?

Answer to question 15: The applicant may propose alternative staffing patterns but if two staff are sharing the responsibilities of the Regional Prevention Coordinator, the applicant must define how the roles and responsibilities will be split among the two staff and provide evidence that both staff proposed are qualified for that position and meeting the following requirements from page 8 of the RFP: The proposed Regional Coordinator must be at minimum, an Associate Prevention Specialist (APS) and obtain the Certified Prevention Specialist (CPS) credential within a year of award. The proposed Regional Coordinators must both be approved by the department. Also, the salary cap for both positions would be the amount of \$60,000 as described on p. 18 of the RFP unless the applicant choses to provide detailed justification for exceeding the salary cap for one or both of the staff proposed. See question 28.

Question 16: On page eight, the RFP states that regional prevention councils must have a full-time staff person on as a coordinator and page 17 notes that the Providence region is not eligible for a regional coordinator. Is there any guidance regarding a minimum or maximum amount of full time employee equivalents (FTE) that would be considered appropriate for a municipal coordinator for the Providence region, or is that entirely at the discretion of the applicant?

Answer to question 16: The level of FTE for Region 3 is at the discretion of the applicant but in light of the fact that Region 3's population exceeds that of Regions 5, 6 and 7 and is roughly equivalent to that of Regions 1 and 4, a minimum of 1 FTE would be defensible and appropriate should it be proposed.

Question 17: Does the \$60,000 budgetary cap for Regional Prevention Coordinators referenced on page 18 apply to municipal prevention coordinators for the Providence region?

Answer to question 17: The \$60,000 cap does apply to Region 3 (Providence). See page 18 of the RFP for specific conditions and possible exceptions.

Question 18: On page 12 of the RFP, there is a reference to increasing the percentage of youth expressing disapproval about use of a substance by 10%, and another on reducing current use by 3%. Are these overall *percentage points* (i.e., if use is currently 15 percent, drop to 12% in one year, a decrease of 20 percent) or percent of the current levels (i.e., if use is currently 15%, drop use by 0.45% to 14.55%)?

Answer to question 18: These targets would apply only to populations and settings in which we have the ability to measure progress with the RI Student Survey (RISS) or project developer approved pre and posttests. Where the RISS is the source of the measure, it represents an overall change in percentage points between RISS administration periods. The ten percent (10%) increase in disapproval of use would be within a two year time frame and can be measured either by a developer approved pre and posttest or by the RISS (the RISS is bi-annual). The three percent (3%) reduction in use would also be accomplished in a four (4) year time frame or two cycles of the RI Student Survey.

Question 19: Do the performance-based incentives mentioned in page 10 of the RFP near the end of the “General Scope of Work” section apply to the Providence region? If so, can any further guidance be provided on how that would work in a single-municipality region?

Answer to question 19: They would not apply to Region 3 (Providence) but exceeding targets from page 10 and/or attainment of the Certified Prevention Specialist Supervisor credential by the municipal coordinator could be the basis for compensation outside of the salary cap from page 18 of the RFP.

Question 20: This question is specific to the Chariho region. We serve three municipalities (Charlestown, Richmond and Hopkinton) as well as the Narragansett Tribe. As such, we have 3 town councils and the Tribal Council and 6 Police Departments that we serve (3 Town, 1 Tribal, 1 State and 1 Federal). We have always been compensated by RISAPA accordingly, as three municipalities, because our coalition does not just serve one separate town. So when the RFP states (pg. 17) that “the funding methodology is population based with maximum awards of \$150,000 and minimum awards of \$10,000 per municipality” ... are we to incur that this means Charlestown, Richmond and Hopkinton are three separate municipalities within this formula? This seems to be how it is stated on page 50 of this RFP. We ask this as we work toward analyzing the budget/cost section of this proposal.

Answer to question 20: Each of the towns is counted as a separate municipality for the purposes of calculating a budget. The approximate budget for each municipality can be calculated using the per capita formula of \$1.42/per person based on the 2015 US Census. No individual municipality will be eligible for more than \$150,000 or less than \$10,000. There has been an operational ‘regional’ task force for many years in place in Chariho, and you may opt to combine funds between the three municipalities to serve the residents, effectively creating a sub-region within the region. There is not a separate tribal set aside

with this funding stream as tribal members are counted in the US Census and are accounted for within the funding formula. Continuation of collaboration with the Narragansett Tribe are encouraged and could strengthen the application for the region.

Question 21: Question Regarding RFP #7550738

The Regional Prevention Task Force RFP was released on June 27, 2016 with a submission date of August 5, 2016. Whereas, Coalitions wishing to respond to the RFP are required to cooperate and collaborate with their local municipalities the six-week turnaround for the application to be submitted to the State of RI places undue burden on the coalitions. Coalitions who seek to have their municipalities serve as fiscal agent will need time to have their request placed on the town council's agenda and will need to seek the approval of the collaborating communities. In the case of my region all six municipal town councils will need to review the plan submitted. This will be impossible in the time frame provided.

Is it possible to extend the deadline for submission to September/October 2016 in order for coalitions to secure municipal agreements?

Answer to question 21:

Addendum 1 has been posted for RFP 7550738 Regional Prevention Task Forces and can be found here:

[http://www.purchasing.ri.gov/bidding/BidDocuments.aspx?BidNumber=7550738&Isridot=False&Status=Active\(Scheduled\)](http://www.purchasing.ri.gov/bidding/BidDocuments.aspx?BidNumber=7550738&Isridot=False&Status=Active(Scheduled)).

Addendum 1 revises the submission deadline from 8/5/2016 at 10:00 AM (ET) to 9/30/2016 at 10:00 AM (ET).

Question 22: Given the required activities and staffing for Year One of the Regional Prevention Task Force Plan Newport County's allotted budget (\$117,789) is inadequate to cover the required components. \$60,000 for the regional coordinator. +60,000 for municipal coalitions (\$10 k for each of the 6 municipalities- page 17) 120,000 Given Newport County's appropriation of \$117,789 the funding available is not enough to cover the minimum requirements.

Additionally, a needs assessment is required during year one at an approximate cost of \$3000 and overhead expenses are suggested up to 10% of allocation.

Will a proposal with a budget over the allotted dollar amount be considered or disqualified without consideration?

Answer to question 22: Please review Section 6: Evaluation and Selection pages 18-19 of the RFP for a description of how budget is impacted by the lowest responsive bidder. If there are multiple applicants for the region, a budget which exceeds the allotted dollar amount may disadvantage the applicant that submits it. Cost is considered during the review process and in the case of multiple bidders/applicants, the lowest responsive bid will receive the benefit of the 15 points. All proposals that score at least 60 points on the Technical Proposal are also evaluated for cost. The cost section is a total of 30 points, 15 for cost and 15

for leveraged funds. The applicant may want to consider other ways of reducing the budget. For example, administrative cost does not have to be allocated or collected. The ten percent (10%) is a maximum allowed. The \$60,000 for a regional coordinator is a cap and for year 1, the compensation can be less or leveraging other funds to offset the costs can be proposed. The RFP also indicates that a contracted training and technical assistance provider (TTA) will provide tools for the needs assessment. Municipal coordinators can receive training and technical assistance on the conduct of a needs assessment from the TTA provider.

Question 23: As outlined on page 17 is it accurate that each municipal coalition within a region should receive \$10,000 in the Year One?

Answer to question 23: That is correct.

Question 24: Question Regarding RFP #7550738

The 60K salary and benefits limit under that grant is incompatible with the salary chart provided on page 18. For example: If the regional coordinator is a Certified Prevention Specialist Supervisor (CPSS) with 5+ years' experience the hourly rate range is \$34-38/hr. At the lower end \$34 x 40 hours x 52 weeks= \$70,720 plus benefits. In year one there is no mechanism for in-kind contributions toward the Regional Coalition Coordinator as it is a new position.

For a region wishing to hire a CPSS is there any variance allowed in determining the salary or raising the \$60,000 salary/benefits cap?

Answer to question 24: A region may propose a salary that exceeds the \$60,000 cap with sufficient justification (see RFP p. 18). These are suggested ranges to establish some form of standardization in hourly rates based on a combination of experience, certification/credentialing and relevant prevention experience but they are not mandated. Similarly, the hypothetical suggests that benefits are offered and this is NOT a requirement of this solicitation. The hourly rate can be offered without a benefits package and full time status can be calculated at 35 hours rather than 40 hours. The salary for the Regional Coordinator must be balanced against other requirements of this solicitation. If the Region in question cannot meet other budgetary obligations (such as the required \$10,000 minimum funding requirement for municipalities within the region), they are not required to offer the level of compensation described in the hypothetical even if the proposed Regional Coordinator possesses these characteristics or qualifications.

Question 25: On page 18 the RFP states: Also see Appendix IV which identifies funding levels for each municipality within the region available to support municipal level activities.

There are not municipal funding levels identified in Appendix IV (or elsewhere).

Could you please state the municipal funding levels?

Answer to question 25: Please apply the funding formula described on page 50 to the population of the municipality based on the criteria described there. This will provide an approximate municipal budget. Please see additional information provided in the response to question 20 about minimum and maximum funding for municipalities.

Question 26: Can you apply to be the Regional Prevention Coordinator if you don't have a CPS? Will you take any other degrees?

Answer to question 26: The Regional Coordinator must be at minimum, an Associate Prevention Specialist (APS) and obtain the Certified Prevention Specialist (CPS) credential within a year of award. The proposed Regional Coordinator must be approved by the department (RFP p.8).

Question 27: Looking at the RFP I would like to have the amounts clarified per region. For ex. Is the East Bay Region eligible for \$150,000 + \$137,615.04 or just the \$137,615.04.

Answer to question 27: \$137,615.04 is available for Region #5 East Bay.

Question 28: Can the position of Regional Prevention coordinator be shared by 2 staff persons ex. one with cps and 1 with aps certification

Answer to question 28: The applicant may propose alternative staffing patterns but if two staff are sharing the responsibilities of the Regional Prevention Coordinator, the applicant must define how the roles and responsibilities will be split among the two staff and provide evidence that both staff proposed are qualified for that position and meet the following requirements from page 8 of the RFP: The proposed Regional Coordinator must be at minimum, an Associate Prevention Specialist (APS) and obtain the Certified Prevention Specialist (CPS) credential within a year of award. The proposed Regional Coordinators must both be approved by the department. Also, the salary cap for both positions would be the amount of \$60,000 as described on p. 18 of the RFP unless the applicant chooses to provide detailed justification for exceeding the salary cap for one or both of the staff proposed. See question 15 and 26.

Question 29: p.14-15 – In regards to the 10% funding step down for years 2-5, does this refer to all funding designated to municipalities or just funding that is used to staff the municipal prevention coordinator position? For instance, if a municipality already funds their coordinator from other sources of funding, but that municipality is designated

\$10000 from this grant for programmatic/seed needs, would this \$10000 remain level for years 2-5?

Answer to question 29: The funding step down only applies to the portion of the municipal coordinators salary/compensation that is applied to these funds (SAMHSA Substance Abuse Block Grant {SABG} Prevention Set-Aside). This does not impact any other funding streams that may be leveraged or support the municipal coordinator salary.

Question 30: There is no form for a proposed year 2-5 budget, is this information to be included in the budget narrative only or does it also belong in the budget form appendix vii?

Answer to question 30: Please use the budget form provided for a year 1 budget and a cumulative 5 year budget. Years 2-5 will be based on the state exercising these option years. Insure that the 5 year budget incorporates the 10% step down in municipal coordinator salary and the use of those funds for intervention implementation. Provide a budget narrative to accompany the two budgets.

Question 31: There is no specific place for listing municipal funding or a breakdown of what these funds would be used for on the budget form appendix vii, is this information to be provided in the narrative only?

Answer to question 31: Please see responses to questions 11 and 25.

Question 32: p. 8 - What is necessary to show "written agreement to participate in all aspects of the evaluation as specified by RI BHDDH"?

Answer to question 32: In the technical proposal, please indicate that the Regional Prevention Coalition, its' Coordinator and municipal coalition members will participate an all aspects of the evaluation as specified by BHDDH and their contracted evaluator.

Question 33: Are there any allowable costs over the amounts listed in appendix 4 for the regional totals? For instance, can the regional coordinator's salary or administrative fee be *in addition* to the dollars allocated to a particular region such that the total proposed cost exceeds the regional amounts listed in appendix 4?

Answer to question 33: The only funds available are those listed as the total for the Region in Appendix IV, p. 50. However, other leveraged funds may be used to the extent allowed by the other funding source in addition to SABG funds allocated the Region in Appendix IV. There may be implications on the

scoring of the Cost section if these are not leveraged or matching funds which are used in addition to the funds for the region. See response to question 22.

Question 34: Under the proposed funding formula on page 17 of the RFP it states a maximum award of \$150,000 per municipality. Is this in addition to the amount on the population based formula of 1.42 per person?

Answer to question 34: It is included in the population based formula and is not an additional source of funds. The approximate budget for each municipality can be calculated use the per capita formula of \$1.42/per person based on the 2015 US Census. No individual municipality will be eligible for more than \$150,000 or less than \$10,000. Also see response to question 20.

Question 35: Page 17 notes a “minimum of 20% of the budget from local resources...”. Can you clarify which of the following scenarios captures that requirement:

- a) The applicant must include 20% of the total budget from local resources, or equal to at least ¼ of its request from the state. For example, if the applicant requests \$150,000 from the state, it must include at least \$37,500 in matching resources, or 20% of the total budget of \$187,500.
- b) The applicant must include local resources equal of 20% of the amount it requests. For example, if the applicant requests \$150,000 from the state, it must include at least \$30,000 in matching resources, for a total minimum budget of \$180,000.

Answer to question 35: Scenario B as described above best captures the requirement of 20% leveraged funds. The bidder/applicant with the most dollars leveraged will receive the maximum points for leveraged funds and all other vendors are measured against as this amount becomes the denominator. Please see page 18 & 19. If the bidder or applicant is from a region (e.g., other than Region 3/Providence) dollars leveraged can also be from municipal partners with whom you have a memorandum of agreement/understanding (e.g., if a municipal task force has a Drug Free Communities Grant or foundation funding).

APPENDIX IV: RHODE ISLAND POPULATION
revised 7.22.2016

Rhode Island Population - 1,052,567 people (based off of 2010 Census Data)

\$1.42 Per Person Calculation Based off of \$1.5 Million/RI Population (except Region 3)

Request: Overall budget for the region administration (personnel up to max of 60k inclusive of salary and fringe (fringe can be in kind or matching) indirect <10% based on cost of running regional office) + budget for municipal allocations

#1 Southern Providence County – 187,345 people \$266,029.90

10% Administration - \$26,602.99

Cranston – 80,387 people
Foster – 4,606 people
North Providence – 32,078 people
Scituate – 10,329 people

Glocester – 9,746 people
Johnston – 28,769 people
Smithfield – 21,430 people

#2 Northern Providence County/ Blackstone Valley – 214,243 people \$304,225.06

10% Administration - \$30,422.50

Burrillville – 15,955 people
Central Falls - 19,376 people
Cumberland – 33,506 people
Lincoln – 21,105 people

North Smithfield – 11,967 people
Pawtucket – 71,148 people
Woonsocket - 41,186 people

#3 Providence – 178,042 people \$150,000.00¹

10% Administration - \$15,000.00

Providence – 178,042 people - ¹Cap for single municipality of \$150,000

#4 Kent County – 172,611 people \$245,107.62

10% Administration - \$24,510.76

Coventry – 35,014 people
Exeter – 6,425 people
West Greenwich – 6,135 people

East Greenwich – 13,146 people
West Warwick – 29,191 people
Warwick – 82,672 people

#5 East Bay – 96,912 people \$137,615.04

10% Administration - \$13,761.50

East Providence - 47,037 people
Barrington – 16,310 people

Warren – 10,611 people
Bristol – 22,954 people

#6 Newport County – 82,950 people \$117,789

10% Administration - \$11,778.90

Jamestown – 5,405 people
Little Compton – 3,492 people
Middletown – 16,150 people

Newport - 24,672 people
Portsmouth – 17,389 people
Tiverton – 15,780 people

#7 South County – 120,554 people \$171,186.68

10% Administration - \$17,118.66

Charlestown – 7,827 people
Hopkinton – 8,188 people
Narragansett – 15,868 people
New Shoreham – 1,051 people

North Kingstown – 26,486 people
Richmond – 7,708 people
South Kingstown – 30,639 people
Westerly – 22,787 people