



June 2, 2016

**Request for Proposal (RFP) for
The Regional Carpool Program
dated April 22, 2016**

**Questions Received from
Proposers' Conference held on May 9, 2016 and Other Questions Submitted**

Dave Cortese, Chair
Santa Clara County

Jake Mackenzie, Vice Chair
Sonoma County and Cities

Alicia C. Aguirre
Cities of San Mateo County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Jason Baker
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Mark Luce
Napa County and Cities

Julie Pierce
Association of Bay Area Governments

Bijan Sartipi
California State
Transportation Agency

Libby Schaaf
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Amy Rein Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Alis Bockelman
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

Q1: Are there provisions for data sharing with the current ridesharing apps that you are working with?

A1: Yes. Please see [17 MTC-Scoop Partnership Agreement.pdf](#) for a description of the data sharing provisions we have in our carpool matching application partnerships.

Q2: Please explain more about how incentives are administered to the riders.

A2: The 511 carpool program has historically: A) provided rotating promotions; and B) marketed and promoted the incentives paid for by the region's Congestion Management Agency (CMA) partners.

The rotating promotions require commuters to log their alternative mode (or carpool) trips to reach the goals and enter to win incentives. Most of the incentives have been in-kind donations of tickets. Rideshare.511.org and [23e Vanpool Standard Operating Procedures FY15-16.pdf](#) describe additional on-going incentives for vanpoolers.

The contractor is responsible for ensuring that 511 provides comprehensive information about incentives available in the region, even if they are county-specific, and coordinate with the region's county transportation demand management (TDM) programs to present all available options.

Q3: There are many tactics for outreach and promotion already listed in the RFP. Have these developed over the years or have other areas informed them?

A3: The list is typical of what rideshare programs do, and is intended to give ideas about what proposers could consider. MTC is interested in creative approaches and perspectives to make the program more effective.

Q4: Any comment on gamification?

A4: Gamification is an interesting concept to explore. MTC is interested in creative approaches and perspective about what proposers have found to be, or anticipate to be, the most effective.

Q5: Are most calls answered live?

A5: Currently, most calls that come to the 511 Rideshare Program are answered live. The current Rideshare program has been the default back-up, in-person resource to answer calls to 511. Going forward, the Carpool Program will fill the 511 back-up in-person role. For more information on call volumes under the current contract, see [3 Call Activity.pdf](#) and [26 Role of Phone Service in the Carpool Program Scope of Work.pdf](#)

Q6: How is the project currently staffed?

A6: The current contract uses approximately twelve (12) full time employees to run the program. However, it has a larger budget and broader scope than in this Request for Proposal.

Q7: Will the new vendor have to maintain and update the existing Ridematching System.

A7: Yes, see Task II of Appendix A, [Scope of Work](#) and the following supporting documents:
[15 Media Beef Subcontract Agreement with Parson Brinckerhoff.pdf](#)
[23d Information Technology SOP FY 15-16.pdf](#)
[23d1 SysAdmin Process Guide.pdf](#)
[23d2 511 RMS Enhancements - 2015-2016.pdf](#)
[23d3 RMS Reports.pdf](#)

Q8: Will MediaBeef transition code and data to the next contractor?

A8: Yes. Please see [15 Media Beef Subcontract Agreement with Parson Brinckerhoff.pdf](#).

Q9: Are the technical specs of the Ridematching System included in the supporting RFP documents?

A9: Yes. Please see:
[23d Information Technology SOP FY 15-16.pdf](#)
[23d1 SysAdmin Process Guide.pdf](#)
[23d2 511 RMS Enhancements - 2015-2016.pdf](#)
[23d3 RMS Reports.pdf](#)

Q10: Where are conflicts of interest called out?

A10: Please see RFP Page 7, and RFP Page 20, Section IX.F.

Q11: Does the Regional Carpool Program Project have a security guard component?

A11: No.

Q12: In Attachment E. Insurance, Section 1.A.5. Errors and Omissions Professional Liability Insurance, if MTC requires a subcontractor/subconsultant to have Professional Liability insurance, is MTC willing to reduce the minimum limits from \$2,000,000 to \$1,000,000 per claim?

A12: No. Please see RFP Page 52, *Appendix E, MTC Standard Consultant Contract*, Article 12.C, and RFP Page 69, *Appendix E, MTC Standard Consultant Contract*, Article 1.A, second paragraph, for more information about subconsultant insurance provisions.

Q13: How many service requests on a monthly basis does MTC receive? A service request type breakdown would be helpful.

A14: Please see [3 Call Activity.pdf](#) for information on phone call and email volumes. Please also see [13 June 2015 Monthly Report Card.pdf](#) and [14 June 2015 Progress Report.pdf](#) for additional metrics about service requests.

Q15. How often are new feature developments planned and rolled out in a year?

A15: For both the Ridematching System (RMS) and the website, new feature developments vary year to year depending on budget and need. Please see [23d2 511 RMS Enhancements - 2015-2016.pdf](#) for an example of one fiscal year's activity for RMS developments. For the website, content updates are always occurring. For example, a great deal of website changes occurred, and are still occurring, in FY15-16 to accommodate MTC's private app partnerships and the launch of 511 NextGen.

Q16: How many customized (skin sites) are already deployed?

A16: Please see [13 June 2015 Monthly Report Card.pdf](#).

Q17: How often are website's (marketing) content updated?

A17: Please see the response to Q15.

Q18: How many active clients and users are served using Rideshare and for commuter benefits programs?

A18: Please see [13 June 2015 Monthly Report Card.pdf](#) and [14 June 2015 Progress Report.pdf](#).

Q19: What is the response time expected from web pages?

A19: There is no requirement for expected website response time. More specifically, the Regional Carpool Contractor will not be responsible for hosting the 511 carpool pages. This will be a responsibility of MTC's 511 website contractor, Civic Resource Group. The Regional Carpool Contractor, however, will host the 511 Ridematch service (see [23d Information Technology SOP FY 15-16.pdf](#) and [15 Media Beef Subcontract Agreement with Parson Brinckerhoff.pdf](#)).

Q20: Are any UX or 508 compliance to be considered for enhancements and new feature development?

A20: Civic Resource Group is responsible for hosting, response time, and UX or 508 compliance. Please see [9 Rideshare Tools Strategy.pdf](#) for more information about the division of labor between the Regional Carpool Contractor and Civic Resource Group regarding 511 website tasks.

Q21: What is Project Office Network, as outlined in the SOP Information Technology Department document?

A21: It is the computer network at Parsons Brinckerhoff's rideshare office.

Q22: Is the Project Office Network still relevant to the new RFP?

A22: No.

Q23: Is the new vendor required to take control of the existing phone system/infrastructure?

A23: No.

Q24: If the new vendor is required to take control of the existing phone system/ infrastructure, where is the infrastructure located?

A24: This question is not applicable. Please see Question and Answer 23.

Q25: Can the insurance coverage requirement of \$4-million be reduced to \$3-million?

A25: No.

Q25: Does the DBE participation attached to this program have to be 8%, or can it be up-to 8%, a documented Good Faith Effort, or a combination of the two?

A25: Please see RFP Page 77, Attachment H, Federally Required Clauses, Section 2.C.

Q26: Could you please confirm that with the program changes, there are projected to be 500 or less inbound Customer Service calls, which can be handled in a real-time or callback scenario?

A26: MTC cannot project how many fewer inbound calls there may be. Please see [3 Call Activity.pdf](#) and [26 Role of Phone Service in the Carpool Program Scope of Work.pdf](#) for more information on call volumes under the current contract. Please see also, RFP Page 29, Appendix A, Scope of Work, Subtask VI.C.

Q27: Is MTC willing to accept the following exception and modification to the contract provisions:

Appendix E: MTC Standard Consultant Contract, Item I: Scope of Services (RFP Page 46 of 114)

In the performance of its services, CONSULTANT represents that it has and will exercise the degree of normal and customary professional care, skill, efficiency, and judgment of consultants with special expertise in providing such services, and CONSULTANT represents that it carries and will maintain all applicable licenses, certificates, and registrations needed for the work in current and good standing.

A27: No.

Q28: Is MTC willing to accept the following exception and modification to the contract provisions:

Appendix E: MTC Standard Consultant Contract, Item 23: Warranty of Services (RFP Page 58)

A. In the performance of its services, CONSULTANT represents and warrants that it has and will exercise the degree of normal and customary professional care, skill, efficiency, and judgment of consultants with special expertise in providing such services, and that it carries and will maintain all applicable licenses, certificates, and registrations needed for the work in current and good standing.

A28: No.

Q29: Is MTC willing to accept the following exception and modification to the contract provisions:

Appendix E: MTC Standard Consultant Contract, Item 23: Warranty of Services (RFP Page 58)

B. In the event that any services provided by CONSULTANT hereunder are deficient because of CONSULTANT's or a sub-consultant's failure to perform said services in accordance with the warranty standards set forth above, MTC shall report such deficiencies in writing to CONSULTANT within 10 days a reasonable time. All other warranties, express or implied are hereby disclaimed by CONSULTANT.

A29: No.

Q30: Is MTC willing to accept the following exception and modification to the contract provisions:

**Appendix E: MTC Standard Consultant Contract, insert after Item 30, (RFP Page 60):
Item 31 Force Majeure.**

An event of "Force Majeure" happens when an event beyond the control of the party claiming Force Majeure prevents such party from fulfilling its obligations. An event of Force Majeure includes, without limitation, acts of God (including floods, hurricanes and other adverse weather), war, riot, civil disorder, acts or threatened acts of terrorism, disease, epidemic, strikes and labor disputes, actions or inactions of government or other authorities, law enforcement actions, curfews, closure of transportation systems or other unusual travel difficulties, or inability to provide a safe working environment for employees. In the event of Force Majeure, the obligations of AECOM to perform the services shall be suspended for the duration of the event of Force Majeure.

A30: No. Please see RFP Page 48, *Appendix E, MTC Standard Consultant Contract*, Article 6.C.