



March 10, 2020

To: Prospective Proposers

From: Norman David, Contracts Administrator

Subject: Q&A for RFP S19261 Central Bikeway Feasibility Study and Alternatives Analysis

The following pages contain responses to questions submitted by prospective Proposers. Do not submit the attached “Q&A” document in your proposal.

Q1. Can Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) efforts be counted towards the SBE goal of the contract?

A1. *CBOs efforts can count towards the SBE goal if the CBOs are registered as SBE firms and are listed and included in the RFP submittals as subconsultants.*

Q2. Can CBO’s efforts be counted in VTA’s evaluation of Local Firm Preference?

A2. *CBOs can count towards Local Firm Preference if CBOs have their main offices within Santa Clara County, and are listed and included in the RFP submittals as subconsultants.*

Q3. Are cost proposals submitted by proponents required to comply with federal acquisition regulation (FAR) part 31 (federal cost principles for for-profit entities)?

A3. *Yes.*

Q4. Do rates need to be based on raw direct pay rate times overhead

A4. *Yes.*

Q5. Can profit be applied to rate inclusive of overhead?

A5. *Yes.*

Q6. In what section should cost proposals be included?

A6. *Cost proposals should be submitted using Form 4.*

Q7. Is there an MWBE goal % for this project?

A7. *VTA has an aspirational goal of 18%, however, there is no MWBE goal for this project. As a reminder, SBE goal is 3.17%*

Q8. Qualifications of firm: is the minimum required amount of similar projects for the entire Proposing team (prime consultant + Subconsultants)? Or three minimum for each firm of the team? Three (3) for Prime; Three (3) for subs?

A8. *The Proposing team must submit a minimum of three (3) examples of similar projects.*



Q9. Can key personnel resumes be included in an Appendix of the proposal response?

A9. Project staffing personnel resumes may be included in an appendix.

Q10. Project Staffing: How should proposer's list out the "degree of commitment to the Project" for each staff? By percentage? Or total number of hours allocated to the project?

A10. Preference would be both, Est. Person hours, and Degree of Commitment to the Project.

Q11. How is the term "Key Personnel" defined by VTA?

A11. Key personnel would be project manager, principal-in-charge, plus people who are responsible for leading important aspects of the project, such as outreach, engineering, design, and technical specialists.

Q12. Form 3 – Exceptions to the Contract: Can proposers submit supplemental info in the form of a red-lined contract with comments attached?

A12. Yes. The use of MS Word with track changes and comments is preferred.

Q13. Form 4 – Cost Proposal Form:

- a. Can VTA provide this form as an excel sheet? If not, can proposers replicate this form in Microsoft excel to help with providing the most accurate information for cost totals?
- b. Alternatively, can proposers submit cost proposals using their own format that includes the same items listed in Form 4?
- c. Are key staff names supposed to be listed under Direct Labor or do we list staff classifications?

A13. (a) – Proposers may replicate Form 4 in MS Excel to help with providing accurate information.

(b) – Yes.

(c) – Key staff may be listed with their classification on the form.

Q14. Are subconsultants required to fill out Form 4? Is there a separate Itemization Cost Form for subconsultants?

A14. Subconsultants are required to fill out Form 4. If itemization cost is needed, subconsultants may provide their own form.

Q15. Are subconsultants required to fill out Forms 5, 6, 7, and 8 or is this the sole responsibility of the Prime?

A15. Subconsultants are not required to fill out forms 5, 6, and 7. Prime consultants are expected to include subconsultant information on those stated forms. Subconsultants are required to fill out form 8.

Q16. The RFP states that VTA seeks to involve Community Based Organizations (CBO) and other highly localized stakeholder groups and that the Consultant must identify in their Proposal potential CBOs that may be engaged and sub-consultants/sub-contractors and to allocated a portion of the budget to compensate the CBOs. The



scope of work also states that potential CBOs will be identified by the Consultant in discussion with VTA and determined by VTA. Is the intent that the Consultant engage with potential CBOs during the proposal phase to add the CBOs to the project team, showcase their staff and role in the proposal, and to provide detailed budget information for the CBO, as typically is done with a sub-consultant, or is the intent that the Consulting include in the proposal a discussion on how CBOs could be utilized, a list of potential CBOs that could fill those rolls, and to assign a general budget for the CBOs in the cost proposal, with the specific roles and CBOs to be defined in coordination with VTA during the contract negotiation phase?

A16. VTA is comfortable with both approaches. This is the first time VTA has used this engagement approach. Identifying potential CBO's roles may provide more clarity on how the proposal intends to use CBO services. VTA also intends to provide a list of CBO's to consultants during the proposal phase. VTA understands that contracting with CBO's could occur after the proposal phase in consultation with VTA. What is most important is that the consultant acknowledges that CBO's will participate in the outreach and engagement process and help formulate those strategies alongside the community, consultant, and other subconsultants. It is also essential that proposers define how they will use CBOs, a list, and a budget. Proposers can, if they wish, reach out to CBO now, but it is not essential to the proposal.

Q17. If the intent is neither one of these two approached, can you provide additional detail on how CBOs should be included in the technical proposal and the cost proposal?

A17. Provide a line item for cost for CBO compensation, and a description in the scope of how you intend to engage and include the CBOs. If you have identified one or more CBOs and roles, you may include additional detail in the scope for what that CBO will provide and additional detail in the budget.

Q18. Can you please provide additional detail on how you propose to evaluate the cost proposal and the “best value” of each team? The scope of work included in the RFP does not provide the level of detail needed to accurately and consistently price the project efforts across teams. Specifically, the scope asks for the consultant to budget for presentations to community groups and staffing pop-ups but does not specify the number of each events to assume for a consistent pricing approach.

A18. Task 3.2 in Attachment 2 requires two public meetings in each phase in both Santa Clara and San Jose for a minimum of six public meetings throughout the project. The task also requests budgeting for live interpretation services, food and necessary childcares services at all public meetings. Task 3.2 also recognizes that the public outreach strategy is to be co-created with stakeholders and CBO's, it notes that, proposers are welcome to suggest different outreach strategies to engage with communities including people with limited English proficiency, low-income households, racial and ethnic minorities, people with various immigration status and people with limited time and resources to get to standard public meetings. VTA has



specifically included Community Engagement in the Work Plan/Project Understanding and allotted 20 points within the overall evaluation criteria. To assist VTA in evaluating cost proposal and “best value” proposals should indicate how many of each type of event is assumed in the budget, include a unit cost for each type of event, and generally describe what is included in the unit cost (e.g. staff hours, mileage, direct expenses, food).

Q19. Additionally, the frequency and duration of regular check-in calls with the VTA project manager and the duration and location of PDT meetings is not defined, which could result in different assumptions and pricing between teams.

A19. Task 6.1 in Attachment 2 require attendance and support for monthly Project Development Team meetings. Regular check-in calls with PM should also occur monthly in between PDT meetings.

Q20. Is the Cost Proposal Form 4 required to be submitted in a separate envelope and bound in proposal package or in a separate envelope and not bound in proposal package?

A20. No, the Cost Proposal Form 4 does NOT need to be submitted in a separate envelope as the project is not A&E.

Q21. Regarding funding (slide 12 of pre-proposal presentations), what percentage of the project budget is allocated to VTA staff? What is the consultant budget for this project?

A21. VTA encourages consultants to review the publicly accessible Sustainable Communities Planning grant VTA received from Caltrans. We ask that consultants recognize that VTA intends to reserve awarded money for VTA staff time to administer the consultant team and our outreach staff. The RFP describes the level of effort expected of VTA’s outreach staff.

Q22. Regarding the audit report/requirements on RFP page 7: may the proposer’s audit report remain confidential if so marked in the proposal? Where in the proposal should we include the audit report?

A22. VTA is subject to the California Public Records Act. Confidential information may be released if requested. The audit reports may be submitted as an appendix, or if not readily available, VTA may request audit reports at a later time.

Q23. Do subcontractors have to meet the Minimum Limits of Insurance as specified in Exhibit 5?

A23. Only the prime consultant needs to meet VTA’s insurance requirements.



Q24. Regarding the notice to proposers of limitation of future contracting on RFP page 3: in light of the fact that this RFP does not call for the selected consultants to develop or influence technical specifications, requirements, scopes, or RFPs for future phases of the Central Bikeway project, can you clarify what future project work the selected consultants will be precluded from? Will the selected consultants be precluded from additional phases of concept and preliminary engineering design on this project, or from future construction work only?

A24. Information developed as part of this project could influence future specifications, requirements or scopes of services and/or RFP's. Should any work that is produced by the successful proposer influence a future procurement they would be precluded from participating in the future. We cannot specific at this time.



**ATTACHMENT A
ACKNOWLEDGMENT FORM**

Proposer must sign this ACKNOWLEDGMENT FORM to indicate receipt of Addenda in order for the proposal to be accepted. Please list each Addendum received, sign, and submit this form with your proposal.

Acknowledgment of Addendum No: _____

Acknowledgment of Addendum No: _____

Acknowledgment of Addendum No: _____

Acknowledgment of Addendum No: _____

Acknowledgment of Addendum No: _____

Proposer's Signature

Date

Name and Title

Firm Name