

Greater Charlotte Regional Freight Study: Request for Proposals (RFP) Q&A

- 1. Would CCOG consider re-issuing an RFP addendum and remove the request for price proposal?**
 - A. CCOG respectfully declines to remove the request for a price proposal. As a requested rather than a required item, the price proposals will have no bearing on the selection of qualified firm(s). Selection will be based solely on proposal quality, qualifications and how well it meets the criteria as outlined in the RFP. CCOG is requesting the price proposal to help us better understand the estimated costs to complete the required tasks as outlined in the RFP. We strongly believe that the qualified firms who perform such Planning Studies are versed and are better equipped with estimating cost for such tasks and that submission of such information is helpful for project planning purposes.

- 2. Is a cost proposal a "requirement" in this proposal package? If a responder does not submit a cost proposal with its package, will its proposal be considered "non-responsive" even though the RFP expressly states that cost proposals are not part of and will not be used as part of the selection process?**
 - A. As part of the RFP, all firms are requested and encouraged to submit a cost proposal. These estimates are non-binding and for informational purposes only, and not part of the selection criteria. While the information is encouraged, proposals lacking this information will not be considered non-responsive.

- 3. Should CCOG clarify and obtain approval from NCBELS that submission of a price proposal in a separate envelope to be opened after award does not compromise NCBELS Licensure requirements or the Mini-Brooks Act?**
 - A. We are not an expert in NCBELS requirements and unfortunately will not be able to reach out and seek approval on this matter. The RFP solicited by CCOG is a Planning Study and not architectural, engineering or surveying study.

- 4. Would a submission from a responder be considered "non-responsive" if an electronic PDF cost proposal is not emailed to the project manager, in light of the fact cost proposals are not part of the selection criteria?**
 - A. As part of the RFP, all firms are requested and encouraged to submit a cost proposal. These estimates are non-binding and for informational purposes only, and not part of the

selection criteria. While the information is encouraged, proposals lacking this information will not be considered non-responsive.

5. The RFP stated a final submission date of December 2016. Is this date being driven by any particular timescales or other agenda item? Do you foresee any issues with the project being delivered earlier?

- A. The completion date of the study is based on our understanding of tasks and estimated time it might take to complete such tasks. The final submission date also takes into account the upcoming plan updates to be undertaken by area MPOs and our intent that the data from this study be relevant and useful for such purpose. We are open to earlier completion date as long as the tasks and requirements in the RFP are fulfilled to our and our partners' satisfaction.

6. What expectations does CCOG have regarding the relationship of the CCOG Freight Mobility Plan and the North Carolina State Freight Plan?

- A. We expect the Greater Charlotte Regional Freight Plan be prepared to align with any NC DOT plans for Freight related planning. While we are not aware of any plans now, we do expect the selected firm to work closely with CCOG staff and NCDOT staff to ensure our plan complements and provides relevant information to the State.

7. Can CCOG confirm status of funding for the Regional Freight Mobility project? We notice that funding was sought from the 2014 TIGER grant process, but the application was unsuccessful and a further application for 2015 may be submitted.

- A. CCOG board and our partners (MPOs/RPOs) are committed to successful completion of this study. We have received funding commitments from our MPO partners and several local government partners and we continue to apply for grants to support the tasks outlined in the scope. We were unsuccessful in securing funds from 2014 TIGER grant but our application received high marks for merit and advanced beyond the first round of review. We will re-apply for a 2015 TIGER grant if those funds become available this year.