

North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)

North Central Texas Regional Transit 2.0: Planning for Year 2050 Request for Proposals (RFP)

Questions and Responses

Question #1: Page 27 of the RFP cites a “similar effort was done of NTTA several years ago.” Which firms were the prime and subcontractor(s) for this NTTA project?

Response: This was a county review study commissioned by NTTA. NCTCOG’s understanding is that Alvarez & Marsal Business Consulting, LLC was the contractor.

Question #2: The given budget of \$1–\$2 million is obviously significant. Should the proposal include costs/budgets for ALL tasks to be performed by the consultant?

Response: The proposal is a qualifications-based proposal therefore no cost should be submitted as part of the proposal response.

Question #3: The separate “RFP Memo” provides an approximate project budget of \$1–\$2 million. Page 17 of the RFP lists the consultant selection criteria but does not mention cost. Is it correct that, provided a proposal is within the \$1–\$2 million budget estimate, budget is not a factor in consultant selection?

Response: Price is not a part of the selection criteria because this is a qualifications-based selection.

Question #4: Page 17 of the RFP states that “NCTCOG will select all the identified tasks or a subset of the tasks to be completed.” Is it correct that NCTCOG may opt to not select some of the services presented in the winning proposal?

Response: NCTCOG reserves the right to do so, but it is not likely.

Question #5: Has NCTCOG engaged consultants in other areas (excluding transportation) to create collaborative regional plan(s)? If so, who were the consultants engaged and what were the purposes of the plan(s)?

Response: Yes, many over the years. Too numerous to list. Please see NCTCOG website.

Question #6: This study is referred to as “2.0,” implying there is a preceding “Regional Transit 1.0” plan. Which previous plan is considered the original “1.0” plan? If there is a “1.0,” can NCTCOG further explain the relationship between these two plans?

Response: “Regional Transit 2.0” is a concept intended to convey the need for an updated vision for transit based on new information and collaboration among transit authorities, member cities, and non-member cities.

Question #7: Who is the NCTCOG Project Manger for the Regional Transit 2.0 Study?

Response: Michael Morris will be the primary NCTCOG Project Manager, with other NCTCOG staff providing expertise.

Question #8: What is the budget for the Regional Transit 2.0 Study?

Response: The anticipated budget for the Regional Transit 2.0 Study is \$1-\$2 million.

Question #9 (updated): If staff from a proposing firm includes a transit authority board member, Regional Transportation Council member, or local elected official Denton County Transportation Authority Board member, would the firm be precluded from submitting a proposal response?

Response: ~~A proposing firm is not necessarily precluded from submitting a proposal response if a member of its staff is on any transportation authority board. NCTCOG will need additional information about the staff member's association with the project in the proposal response to determine the firm's eligibility.~~

If a proposal team, including a prime or subconsultant, includes a transit authority board member, Regional Transportation Council member (primary or alternate), or local elected official as a member of the proposal team (e.g., an employee or contractor), the proposal should include an evaluation of any conflicts of interests (i.e., actual or appearance of conflict). Proposal responses should include a 1) statement to NCTCOG clearly stating the nature of the conflict, 2) whether all parties to the proposal are aware of the conflict, 3) whether the conflict violates the policies of any firm included as part of the proposal team, and 4) what mechanisms would be utilized to mitigate the conflict. It is difficult to forecast all of the potential professional, financial, and organizational conflicts that could be presented in the situation described above. For firms with employees or contractors on a transit authority board, the Regional Transportation Council (primary or alternate), or local government elected officials, NCTCOG would be hard pressed to conclude that any protocols could sufficiently mitigate both an actual conflict and the appearance of a conflict. Proposer's statement regarding conflicts do not count against the page limits.

Question #10: Is a firm's Project Manager for the Regional Transit 2.0 Study required to be a professional engineer?

Response: No, the Project Manager for a firm submitting the proposal response does not need to be a professional engineer.

Question #11: Can attendees get a copy of the Pre-Proposal Conference sign-in sheet?

Response: Yes, a copy of the sign-in sheet, including both in-person and virtual attendees, will be posted on the NCTCOG website at www.nctcoq.org/rfp.

Question #12: Who are the members of the Consultant Selection Committee?

Response: Consultant Selection Committee members are not shared as part of the proposal details.

Question #13: When are Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) firms matched with prime firms?

Response: NCTCOG's expectation is that proposal responses include the subcontractors (DBE & non-DBE) that will conduct the appropriate elements of the project scope of work.

Question #14: If a firm does not see a particular expertise code for their product or service, what does a firm do? Would the firm communicate at the meeting today the area of interest/expertise for prime firms to express their interest?

Response: Utilize the pre-proposal conference meeting and sign-in sheet as a means to communicate firm's area of expertise and try to set up meetings with other firms to share information about your core competencies.

Question #15: Will contract exceptions and negotiation of terms and conditions be accepted from the awarded consultant?

Response: It is recommended that proposal responses include any anticipated exceptions, which will be taken into consideration during contract negotiations.

Question #16: The RFP states the study must be conducted by a top tier, globally recognized consulting firm such as McKinsey, Bain, Deloitte, etc. Would these mentioned firms be considered incumbents?

Response: No. Attachment 2, included as additional information to the RFP document, is a letter from transit authority member cities/counties requesting the study which references the firms listed above. The letter was provided for background and context and is not a requirement of the Request for Proposal.