



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Amy Rein Worth, Chair
Cities of Contra Costa County

Dave Cortese, Vice Chair
Santa Clara County

Alicia C. Aguirre
Cities of San Mateo County

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

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini
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
Association of Bay Area Governments

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Joe Pirzynski
Cities of Santa Clara County

Jean Quan
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

January 28, 2014

Addendum No. 1
to
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
AUDITING, ATTESTATION, AND CONSULTING SERVICES
Dated December 16, 2013

Dear Auditor:

This letter is Addendum No. 1 to the Request for Qualifications for Auditing, Attestation, and Consulting Services dated December 16, 2013. Where text is revised, deleted text is shown in strike-through format; added text is *italicized*. The RFQ is revised as follows:

Addendum Item	Reference	Change(s)
1.	RFQ, III. <u>Scope of Work, Schedule and Budget, C. Project Budget</u> , Page 3	The estimated total budget for the <i>first year of the</i> initial five year term of the contract(s) is three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000). Additional amounts for future years will be subject to approval of future MTC budgets allocating such funds. Each firm selected through this RFQ to audit third parties will be paid directly by MTC, MTC SAFE, BATA, BAIFA or BAHA. Federal funds may be used for one or more contracts; accordingly, firms must be willing to accept federal contracting terms and conditions in Appendices C and D included in this RFQ.

The remaining provisions of the RFQ, dated December 16, 2013 remain unchanged. In the event of a conflict between this addendum and the previous version(s), this addendum shall take precedence.

Questions and Answers regarding this RFQ are enclosed with this Addendum.

Any questions concerning this addendum to the RFQ should be directed to Debbie Atmaja, Project Manager at (510) 817-5958 or datmaja@mtc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Steve Heminger
Executive Director

SH:da

J:\CONTRACT\Procurements\Finance\MTC\2014 Audit & Attestation Services\2014 Audit & Attestation Services RFQ Addendum 1_final.pdf

January 28, 2014

**Request for Qualification (RFQ) for
Auditing, Attestation, and Consulting Services
Dated December 16, 2013**

**Questions & Answers:
From Proposers' Conference
on January 14, 2014
and Received as Questions, Clarifications and Exceptions on January 17, 2014**

- Q1 Why is MTC changing auditors at this time?
A1 The current auditing contract(s) are expiring and as a public entity, MTC is required to competitively bid for these services.
- Q2 Will your prior auditors be invited to bid?
A2 Yes.
- Q3 How many staff members did the audit team consist of in the past?
A3 The number of staff members depends on the engagement.
- Q4 Is the scope of the services requested the same as last year?
A4 Please see RFQ, Appendix A, Scope of Work.
- Q5 Will MTC be awarding to multiple Auditors, or to a single Auditor?
A5 Per the RFQ, Letter of Invitation, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence: "MTC intends to select one or more audit firms to provide assurance, audit and consulting services."
- Q6 In the past was there more than one Auditor performing these services?
A6 Five audit firms were selected and placed in pre-qualified pool to provide these services.
- Q7 How many audits were performed over the last 5 years?
A7 Approximately 30.
- Q8 Any expectation that the number of audits will increase in the next 5 years?
A8 No. However, if there are new federal compliance requirements, the number of audits may increase.
- Q9 Are the main MTC auditors able to submit a SOQ in response to this RFQ? Also, who is the main MTC auditor?
A9 PricewaterhouseCoopers. The firm is eligible to submit a SOQ in response to this RFQ.
- Q10 Is experience with OMB Circular A-133 pertaining to single audit under this RFQ?
A10 No, the OMB Circular A-133 pertains to the Program specific audit.
- Q11 What types of reports will the Auditors selected under this RFQ be required to work on?
A11 Primarily contract pre-award audits, agreed upon procedures and consulting services.

Q12 Who are the firms in the current pool for these services? Are they eligible to respond to the RFQ?

A12 The current pool consists of 5 audit firms: Caporicci and Larson, Deloitte, KPMG, Macias Gini & O'Connell, and Williams, Adley & Co. These firms are eligible to respond to this RFQ.

Q13 What is meant by description of firm's audit policy on page 5?

A13 Firm's audit policy means the firm's approach to the audit.

Q14 On page 6, MTC asks for the qualifications of the team and the numbers of staff to work on the engagements. MTC expects resumes to be included. It is hard to know the scope and type of work to be worked on. How should responding firms address this requirement?

A14 The responding firms should present qualifications and experiences of the team and the numbers of staff anticipated to be engaged in performing services under the contract.

Q15 Is it permissible for a firm to be a joint venture or propose sub-consultants in response to this RFQ?

A15 Yes.

Q16 Evaluation criteria – how are the evaluation criteria weighted? (page 7)

A16 Please see page 7 of the RFQ. The evaluation criteria are listed in descending order of relative importance.

Q17 Would a Statement of Qualifications be responsive if the responding firm opens an office in the city of Oakland, but its employees do not live in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area?

A17 Please refer to page 2 of the RFQ, II. Minimum Qualifications. No, not if the local office is not yet open.