



Questions & Answers

Request for Proposals for Technical and Communications Services for the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study

Date: April 19, 2019
To: Interested Firms and Individuals
From: Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director
Subject: Request for Proposals to Provide Technical and Communications Services for the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study (RFP 18/19-10)

The Transportation Authority received the following questions in italics submitted by 5:00 p.m. on April 16, 2019.

- 1. The RFP discusses equity and other technical analyses but does not specifically address economic and retail impacts that were included in the 2010 Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study (MAPS) and that may require specialty consultants. Do you expect proposals to incorporate these impacts?*

The RFP purposefully did not specify any particular types of analyses; proposers should include what they deem critical to meeting the study objectives. For example, effects on businesses were an issue raised during MAPS outreach and are expected to remain a concern, but proposers should consider whether technical analysis is needed to address the issue and, if so, what type of analysis is warranted.

- 2. How will the evaluation process work in terms of scoring – will Options A, B, and C be scored on the same 100-point scale?*

Yes, proposals submitting on Options A, B, and C will be scored against the same evaluation criteria and 100-point scale identified in Section VI of the RFP. Proposals will be scored based on quality in terms of understanding of project objectives, technical and management approach, and capabilities and experience, only for the workstreams being proposed. If interviews are held, there will be a second round of evaluation that will include specific interview questions for each workstream which will aid the evaluation panel in selecting one or more proposing firms.

- 3. Will the Transportation Authority select different workstreams from different proposals?*

Possibly. The Transportation Authority may select one firm/team that proposes on all workstreams (Option C) or may select certain workstreams from two firms'/teams' proposals so that all four workstreams are covered and collectively provide the best overall service package to the Transportation Authority.

- 4. Is the Transportation Authority open to including the feedback heard from equity outreach and community engagement in the design of the pricing programs, or are there constraints on the program design? For example, would the Transportation Authority consider including non-transportation expenditures in the recommended uses of revenue, if that is what stakeholders ask for through outreach?*

We will consider all ideas suggested by the public, though the use of revenues generally should have a nexus to the Study's purpose and need.

5. *Is the Study goal to get people out of their cars and onto public transit or to generate revenue for other purposes?*

While the ability for congestion pricing systems to generate revenue is an important feature, the purpose of a potential pricing system is to raise overall system performance (efficient and effective movement of people and goods) in pursuit of our transportation and citywide goals.

6. *To what extent will this Study intersect with the city's Vision Zero effort in addressing hotspots for pedestrian and bicycle safety? What is the flexibility for incorporating stakeholder engagement around Vision Zero in the proposal, such as crosswalk design?*

The 2010 MAPS considered the safety and health effects of congestion pricing and the City and County of San Francisco has since adopted specific Vision Zero goals. Proposers are welcome to suggest how congestion pricing could help support San Francisco's traffic safety efforts.

7. *Given that there will be regional funding and likely a regional impact and reaction to this Study, is there an expectation that proposers will incorporate regional stakeholder engagement?*

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is a potential funding partner in the Study. Regardless of that possibility, yes proposers should suggest an approach that will enable the Study to receive the necessary approvals and enable to the Study to meet its objectives.

8. *Will the selected firm(s)/ team(s) be conflicted out of future phases of congestion pricing work?*

Generally, no; however, proposers should disclose any potential or perceived conflicts of interest and how they propose to avoid or minimize them. The Transportation Authority will evaluate each case individually to determine if any conflict of interest exists.

9. *Has the SF-CHAMP model been updated since the 2010 MAPS and is there an identified level of effort for agency staff to work on the model for this Study?*

Yes, the SF-CHAMP model has been updated multiple times since the MAPS to incorporate additional capabilities such as estimating transportation network company (TNC) trips, enhancing our pricing sub-model, and refining time of day features. Agency staff time is included in the overall project budget to assist with SF-CHAMP modeling or related analyses. Proposers are welcome to propose different uses for the funding reserved for the Transportation Authority's budgeted staff work.

10. *Would the Transportation Authority consider making minor revisions in coordination with the selected consultant to the insurance specifications to reflect how these types of policies are typically written in the commercial marketplace at this time?*

Yes, proposers may propose limited modifications to the standard contract language in their proposals for the Transportation Authority's consideration.

11. *Would the Transportation Authority consider revising the insurance requirements so that a prime consultant may reasonably set insurance requirements for its subconsultants in its own discretion? Most Professional Liability policies do not allow for the addition of additional insureds, and small companies (such as Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs)) will likely not have \$2,000,000 per claim and aggregate limits for Professional Liability.*

See response to Question #10.

12. *Would the Transportation Authority consider removing the defense obligations and limiting the extent of the indemnity obligations to apply solely the extent caused by the selected consultant's negligence and those for whom the selected consultant would be legally liable?*

See response to Question #10.

13. *Would the Transportation Authority consider a separate indemnity obligation with respect to claims resulting from professional services so that the defense obligations are removed and limiting the extent of the indemnity obligations to apply solely the extent caused by the selected consultant's negligence and those for whom the selected consultant would be legally liable? Insurance will not cover "up front" defense costs upon mere allegations of wrongdoing for professional liability matters. For General Liability matters – i.e. where Commercial General Liability insurance applies – this is not an issue because as an additional insured entity the Transportation Authority will be granted a defense by the carrier. On the professional liability side, however, such defense costs would be borne by the selected consultant directly, since they cannot be passed on to the insurance company regardless of their cost. We are happy to reimburse defense costs and expenses that the Transportation Authority incurs that arise out of our negligent performance of professional services once that has been finally determined in a binding proceeding like a trial or arbitration. Those defense costs are typically covered by professional liability insurance.*

See response to Question #10.

14. *Would the Transportation Authority consider a mutual waiver on incidental and consequential damages? These damages are typically uninsurable and usually not foreseeable.*

See response to Question #10.

15. *Can you confirm that the 14% DBE applies to each workstream — as in, proposers should strive for 14% of the budget allocated for each workstream, no matter the allocation of budget between workstreams — rather than simply 14% of the total contract value?*

As discussed in Addendum #1 to the RFP, the 14% DBE goal will apply to the entire proposal/contract value regardless of which option (A, B, or C) is being proposed.

16. *If a firm's DBE certification is in progress at the time the proposal is submitted, can they still count toward the DBE goal?*

No, as stated under RFP Section VII, "A DBE must be a small business firm defined pursuant to 13 CFR 121 and be certified through the California Unified Certification Program by the proposal due date."

17. *Are the cost proposals scored? If so, as part of which criterion?*

No, only the cost proposal of the top-ranked firm(s) will be opened following selection by the evaluation panel. Technical proposals will be scored against the evaluation criteria in RFP Section VI.

18. *If a proposer proposes on Option C, will the Transportation Authority consider breaking apart their team? Or consider asking a proposer to mix and match their technical proposal with the engagement proposal from another team (for example)?*

Possibly, the Transportation Authority may consider selecting only certain workstreams of a proposal which therefore may involve selecting the applicable subconsultants from a team. If two or more firms/teams are selected, they may be asked to come to a joint working arrangement if they are amenable to doing so; otherwise separate contracts to the firms/teams may be offered for the different workstreams. In the event that the Transportation Authority

issues separate contracts for different workstreams, the Transportation Authority will be responsible for leading overall team coordination between the selected consultants.

19. *Under RFP Section IV, Task 3.2, there is an indication that it may be necessary to gather “additional observed data.” Without a full understanding of the data currently available, this item will be very difficult to estimate cost. Are proposers to assume a line item for data collection? Or would the Transportation Authority cover the costs of additional data gathering?*

The Transportation Authority does not anticipate that additional data collection will be needed for the topic areas listed in Task 3.2 (“existing synthesized data is available on traffic congestion...” etc.). The reference to the potential need for additional data is specifically in reference to the equity analysis, since the Transportation Authority does not currently have observed demographic data for downtown travelers. Additional data collection to support the equity analysis would be part of the proposer’s budget.

20. *Regarding the hypothetical scenario in RFP Section V, Subsection 2, can the Transportation Authority confirm that the body of the proposal is to include person hours and direct costs only (and the detailed budget is part of the cost proposal only)? Is it correct that there should be no total budget figure in the body of the proposal?*

Yes, please include a staffing plan with level of effort (e.g. person hours per staff) for both the scope of services and the hypothetical scenario in the technical proposal. For the hypothetical scenario this may also include direct costs and assumptions about the Transportation Authority’s expenditures. However, do not include budget or rate information for either the scope of services or the hypothetical scenario in the technical proposal - this should be contained in the cost proposal that is submitted separately per RFP Section V.

21. *On page 14, the RFP requires submittals to “demonstrate the proposer’s knowledge of adjacent projects and their potential impacts to the delivery of the services of this RFP.” Can you clarify the meaning of “adjacent” projects?*

In this context, “adjacent” projects is intended to refer to other major projects, policy proposals, and planning efforts, regardless of location, that would either significantly affect or be affected by implementation of congestion pricing and should therefore be coordinated with this Study.

22. *Will the Transportation Authority consider scenarios with different pricing schemes for different vehicles or services, such as TNCs and non-TNC vehicles?*

Yes, the Transportation Authority is willing to consider a wide range of pricing proposals, including charging vehicles or services differently if doing so would best meet the Study objectives. Proposers should address the legality or need for legislative authority for such approaches, as warranted.

23. *Is the requirement to develop a preferred program just about congestion pricing, or does it also include complementary measures around supply of roads, parking, public transit, active modes and intelligent transportation systems (ITS) more generally?*

The proposed congestion pricing program definition should be focused on the program elements listed in Task 2.5 under RFP Section IV, but could include other complementary measures that proposers believe would be important to successfully implement the program and meet identified goals and objectives. Note that the list of elements in Task 2.5 includes “a package of local and regional multimodal improvements to be funded with program revenues” as well as “options for technology solutions to implement the program.”

24. *Does the Transportation Authority see price setting of parking and public transit as being relevant in the scope of a congestion pricing program?*

This Study is not intended to set overall City and County of San Francisco policy on parking and public transit pricing, but the “discounts, subsidies, incentives, and travel demand management tools/programs to reduce the burden of pricing on vulnerable populations and encourage the use of sustainable travel modes” listed among the program definition elements in Task 2.5 of the RFP Section IV could incorporate parking and/or public transit discounts, subsidies, incentives, etc.

25. *What breakdown of data does the Transportation Authority have about the costs of congestion to business, by business type, location, size?*

The Transportation Authority has not collected data or conducted an analysis of the costs of congestion on businesses since the MAPS was completed. The MAPS conducted an economic analysis and estimated the economic costs of congestion but did not segment this data by business type, location, and size. See the [MAPS Final Report](#) for more information on the analysis the study included.

26. *Can a firm/ team be selected for fewer than the workstreams it proposed on?*

Yes, see response to question #18.

27. *Is the 14% DBE a contract goal for all workstreams proposed on, or at least 14% per workstream? If the latter, we would like to request relaxing the per workstream goal in some way provided the contract total still meets or exceeds 14%.*

Yes, see response to question #15.

28. *Are there any restrictions or incentives to contract with non-profit organizations?*

No.

29. *Under RFP Section IV, Task 1.1, first bullet - is the policy advisory committee (PAC) to be convened in Task 1.4 or 1.3?*

As corrected in Addendum #1 to the RFP, the PAC is to be convened in Task 1.3.

30. *Can you provide more direction on what you are looking for on the hypothetical scenario?*

The hypothetical scenario is intended to provide proposers an opportunity to think creatively and identify additional services that are not essential to accomplish the core scope of services but would further enhance the Study’s likelihood of reaching its objectives. Proposers should identify which workstream(s) they would propose to enhance if additional budget (up to \$100,000) were available to augment the Study’s consultant funds and how they would use the additional resources.

31. *Is there a limit to the number of interview attendees?*

Typically yes, but it is at the discretion of the evaluation panel to determine if a limit is required and if so what that limit is. Any limit will be communicated through the invitation to interview letter.

32. *Do potential interviews allow for participation by phone?*

Typically no, but it is at the discretion of the evaluation panel to determine if participation by phone or web-conference will be allowed. This will be communicated through the invitation

to interview letter. If phone or web-conference participation is allowed, at a minimum the firm/team's proposed project manager should attend in person.

33. *Which previous project/contract, if any, is the most similar to this one (particularly in terms of scope), and which consultant(s) was selected for that contract?*

In terms of the structure of the scope of services and the different workstreams, the Transportation Authority does not have a precedent project or contract. In terms of the project subject matter, the most similar precedents are RFP 05/06-21 for Transportation Planning Services for a Feasibility Study of Congestion Pricing, also known as MAPS, (contract awarded to PBS&J); as well as RFP 12/13-03 for Technical Consultant Services for the San Francisco Parking Pricing and Regulation Study (contract award to Cambridge Systematics, Inc.); RFP 12/13-06 for Technical Consultant Services for the Treasure Island Mobility Management Study (contract awarded to WSP USA Inc.); and RFP 14/15-07 for Planning and Engineering Services for the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management Study Phase 2 (contract awarded to AECOM).

For more information regarding the RFP, visit the Transportation Authority's website: www.sfcta.org/contracting.