



## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ALAMEDA CTC RFP NO. R23-0002

The following answers are in response to questions submitted by prospective proposers for education, communications, and outreach services for the Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools Program (SR2S), Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) Request for Proposals (RFP) No. R23-0002. This document provides the written responses to all questions that were received by Alameda CTC on or before October 20, 2022. Questions may have been edited for grammar and clarity.

### **Q1. Who is the incumbent for these services? Are the incumbents interested in bidding again?**

- A1.** The incumbent consultant is Toole Design Group, LLC. A list of interested parties for this RFP has been posted under RFP Documents on the Contract Opportunities webpage:  
<http://alamedactc.org/contracting-opportunities/>

### **Q2. Have Safe Routes to School Services always been broken out into two separate contracts? Who is the incumbent for the data contract?**

- A2.** There are currently three Safe Routes to Schools Contracts: (i) Professional Services for Safe Routes to Schools Direct Student Safety Training and Education with Alta Planning + Design, Inc., (ii) Professional Services for Safe Routes to Schools Site Assessments, Data Collection and Analysis, and Program Evaluation Services with Alta Planning + Design, Inc., and (iii) Professional Services for Safe Routes to Schools Education and Outreach Services with Toole Design Group, LLC.

### **Q3. Is there anything different you would like to see done with this forthcoming contract compared to previous contracts for these services? What has worked? What has not worked?**

- A3.** Alameda CTC seeks continuous improvement in all of our initiatives. Respondents are welcome to identify additional and/or new approaches that meet the goals, outcomes, and intent of the program and tasks detailed in the RFP. Respondents may propose new or modified programming either as part of the tasks identified in the RFP or as optional tasks, including describing how the proposal would support the adopted program principles and goals.

### **Q4. In the Cost Proposal Form B, Form B-7: Rates by Firm, do all staff have to be listed by name under Column C (Personnel Name)? Or, may the proposer list key staff by name, then list all other staff roles as “Classification Maximum.”**

- A4.** For the proposal, proposers should list Key Personnel by name with an asterisk (\*), per the footnote of the RFP’s Form B7 table. Proposers may list other personnel by their classification without individual names, with a maximum rate for each classification. Each billing rate should be broken down into direct salary, fringe, overhead, annual escalation, and profit rate. Compensation for the resulting contract is anticipated to be based on specific rates of compensation and/or lump sum by task, but is subject to the terms and conditions established as a result of negotiations.

**Q5. Should the Cost Proposal Form B be prepared for 1 program year, or, the full 36 month performance period?**

**A5.** The Cost Proposal Form B shall be prepared for the full 36 month performance period. The anticipated performance period is for an initial 36 months from July 1, 2023, to July 1, 2026, with options for up to 2 additional years of service.

**Q6. Can a consultant use a provisional indirect cost rate for the forthcoming year, including a margin for any unexpected changes in order to determine the cap for the rate? Or, do consultants have to use the current audited indirect cost rate?**

**A6.** No, the selected consultant shall not use a provisional indirect cost rate on the resulting contract. Per the RFP, the indirect cost rate must be provided for the most recent Fiscal Period (one-year accounting period); i.e., 01/01/2021 – 12/31/2021 or 07/01/2021 – 06/30/2022, whichever is later. Additionally, an Independent Auditors' Report (for indirect cost rate audits) must be provided, or if unavailable, an indirect cost rate schedule may be acceptable. If there is any reason that specific items are incomplete or not provided, proposers must include a justification for each item explaining why it was incomplete or not provided.

**Q7. For small Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) firms for whom the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)/Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) auditing process may be prohibitively expensive, is there a process for determining negotiated billing rates? If so, what is the process?**

**A7.** As noted in the RFP, an indirect cost rate schedule may be acceptable for the prime and its subs if an Independent Auditors' Report (for indirect cost rate audits) is unavailable. A sample indirect cost rate schedule is available at <https://www.alamedactc.org/get-involved/contracting-forms/>. Otherwise, if eligible, a prime or sub may submit the Safe Harbor Rate – Consultant Certification of Eligibility of Contract Costs and Financial Management System referenced in the RFP and available on the above web page to use the California Department of Transportation Safe Harbor Indirect Cost Rate (SHR) home rate of 120%. The indirect cost rate (including the SHR) is not eligible for negotiation, however, the profit rate, which may not exceed 8-10%, is subject to negotiations.

**Q8. What is the annual budget for this program? What is the anticipated budget for media buying, is media buying a separate budget?**

**A8.** The two SR2S program Professional Services contract budgets will be negotiated with the top-ranked firms and brought to the Commission for approval. There is no separate budget for media buys; contractors may include proposals for media buying strategies and costs in proposals.

For historical information, the three current contracts for Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools Program including funding for FY 2022-23 in the amounts noted below. Amounts from previous years in no way represent a commitment from the agency to fund the program at specific levels in future years.

- Direct Student Safety Training services: \$1,291,640
- School Site Assessments, Data Collection and Analysis and Program Evaluation services: \$547,462.00
- Education and Outreach services: \$1,390,164.00

**Q9. Would you consider moving the December 28, 2022 interview date, to a date outside of the holiday window?**

**A9.** Due to time constraints, Alameda CTC does not anticipate modifying the schedule for this RFP.