COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Q&A for

Community Climate Action Plan and Safety Element RFP RFP# CCAP SE 2021

Q&A dated: December 10, 2021

Responses to Questions submitted by vendors who contacted the County Planning Department:

Scope and budget Q’s:

1. **The scope of work is extensive for the budget allocated. Would the County consider additional budget or scope reduction?**

The County does not have additional budget available. If a bidder considers the scope of work cannot be achieved within the budget, the County requests the bidder identify in the bid response the work that can be achieved within the budget. If a bidder is submitting a bid which proposes a reduced scope, the consultant should:

* Focus the scope of work on completing the Safety Element. There are statutory requirements and deadlines that apply, and these are a priority for the County.
* Clearly identify which components of the work are proposed to be completed and those which are proposed to not be completed or proposed to be completed by County staff, rather than by the consultant.
* Outline a proposal for a scope of work at or under the budget and provide an option or options for completion of the components of work that are not included within the budget, which the County could consider pursuing if additional funds become available or if the County can complete some of those tasks internally.
* If the bidder recommends a reduced or alternative scope for the CCAP update, the County is open to considering that, including any best-practice or innovative models. The CCAP should address contributions the unincorporated communities should make towards achieving carbon neutrality, but the CCAP may propose a fewer number of more streamlined measures than are included in the existing CCAP and may include a reduced or alternative scope for addressing GHG reductions, if the bidder recommends this is possible and appropriate.

1. **The budget assigned for the Climate Vulnerability Assessment in Task 5 is very specific (not to exceed $53,000). Has this been scoped out and/or is it part of a grant received?**

The County has been allocated a grant of $53,495 in REAP funds which is proposed to be put towards preparation of the Safety Element. The amount available for Task 5 is $53,495.00. The amount of $53,000 for Task 5 has been corrected in the RFP Addendum to $53,495, and the overall budget corrected to $213,495.

The County is required to identify to ABAG which component of the Safety Element work the grant will be spent on, and must demonstrate a nexus between the work and the provision of housing in the County. The County has identified the Climate Vulnerability Assessment as the portion of the Safety Element work that can achieve this requirement, and will be seeking approval from ABAG to use the $53,495 in funds towards preparation of a Climate Vulnerability Assessment pursuant to SB 379.

The scope of work for this task has not been determined. The scope will be confirmed once a successful bidder provides details the work proposed for that task.

1. **Regarding Task 5: Climate Vulnerability Assessment, if the Contractor can complete this task using less than the $53,000 allocated, can the remaining budget be applied to other tasks?**

If the Climate Vulnerability Assessment can be completed for less than $53,000 and a bidder wishes to include other related tasks (for example, obtaining public input on this item) in this budget item, the bidder should specify this in the bid response.

1. **In Task 9, how many meetings are there? Does it include two Board sub-committee meetings and one meeting of the full Board?**

For a General Plan Amendment, the County must take the proposed amendment to the Planning Commission and the following meetings of the Board of Supervisors:

* Board of Supervisors Transportation & Planning Committee;
* Board of Supervisors Unincorporated Services Committee;
* Full Board of Supervisors – for adoption.

The County will also be required to take the proposed General Plan Amendment to various community meetings, including those listed in Task 9. The “minimum” meeting list in Task 9 has been updated in the RFP Addendum to include additional community meetings. We anticipate this represents a complete list of meetings. However, staff may receive direction from the Board Committees about which community meetings need to be attended prior to adoption of a final amendment.

As identified in Task 9, if an item is carried over or continued, the successful bidder would be required to prepare for and present at a meeting or meetings for a second time. For budget purposes, a bidder should assume attending at least 8 community meetings, 1 meeting of the Planning Commission, 2 meetings of Board Committees and 1 meeting of the Full Board: 12 meetings in total. The bidder may wish to include allowance for up to an additional 4 meetings.

1. **Task 1 says the consultant shall, “Pay for all expenses associated with the project, including but not limited to meeting materials, translation, stipends and technology (e.g. access to tablets)”. Do these expenses need to be comprehensively itemized in the budget?**

The bid does not need to comprehensively identify the breakdown of all of these items. It will be sufficient to include one or more line-items in the bid indicating generally what the anticipated costs will be for these types of expenses. The cost for expenses shall not exceed the budget line item identified for these costs, and shall not cause the overall budget to be exceeded.

1. **Task 4: Community Engagement Planning, mentions “Stipends for community participation in the project”. Do details (e.g., amount, number of stipends) need to be made explicit in our submittal? And has the use of stipends been pre-approved by the County, or do you anticipate any contractual/procedural issues in providing those stipends to community organizations or other participants?**

You do not need to specify the exact number or amount of stipends. It will be sufficient to identify total anticipate amount of budget that will be put towards stipends. The County does not anticipate contractual or procedural issues for the consultant to provide stipends to community organizations and participants.

1. **Page 7 of Exhibit A: Bid Response Packet states: “The estimated number of hours for each individual, corresponding hourly rates per individual and extended costs.” Can bidders propose labor rates by category as opposed to a separate rate for each person working on the project?**

Yes. You can propose labor rates by category. Please identify key personal, where appropriate, and for those individuals, identify which labor rate category applies.

Safety Element Q’s:

1. **Does the Safety Element on the County’s website include the most recent amendments adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 25, 2017?**

The County website was updated on December 7, 2021, to include the current version of the Safety Element, including the April 25, 2017 amendments. If you downloaded the Safety Element before this date, please download the current version here: <https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/SafetyElementAmendmentFinal.pdf>.

The amendments to the Safety Element adopted on April 25, 2017, to comply with Senate Bill 1241 (Kehoe, 2012) and to incorporate the 2016 LHMP are available here: <http://www.acgov.org/board/bos_calendar/documents/DocsAgendaPlan_04_25_17/9SafetyElement.pdf>.

1. **Is the Climate Vulnerability Assessment (Task 5) meant to focus on the unincorporated county?**

Yes. All of the work under this RFP, including the Climate Vulnerability Assessment, should focus on unincorporated Alameda County. The unincorporated County is the jurisdiction of the County Planning Department. All other areas within the County will be addressed in the cities’ Safety Elements and General Plans.

1. **In addition to extreme heat and evacuation routes, are there any other major updates you expect are needed to the Safety Element?**

We anticipate the majority of the work for the update to the Safety Element will be responding to climate adaptation and resilience in accordance with SB 379 (2015). As identified in the RFP, in addition to SB 379, the update will also be required to respond to all applicable state legislation, including SB 1035 (2019), SB 99 (2019) and AB 747 (2019). The RFP Addendum has been updated to include AB 1409 (2021).

In preparing the bid response and understanding the scope of what has already been covered in previous updates, the bidder should review the current Safety Element and most recent updates to the Safety Element from April 25, 2017 (see link in the answer to Q8 above). The bidder should also review the proposed updated LHMP prepared by the County General Services Agency (see link in Exhibit B to the RFP), which is proposed for adoption by the Board of Supervisors early in 2022.

1. **Will the County be updating the Emergency Operations Plan under a separate contract? And will this fulfill the requirements of SB99 and AB747 (as they relate to the Safety Element)?**

The County Sheriff’s Office, Office of Emergency Services, is in the process of preparing an update to the County’s Emergency Operations Plan (OES EOP). The OES EOP is Countywide, and includes unincorporated Alameda County. The existing OES EOP is available here: <https://www.acgov.org/ready/documents/EmergencyOperationsPlan.pdf>.

The County is seeking the consultant’s advice about the extent to which the OES EOP, the LHMP and other existing documents and updates in-progress, satisfy the requirements of SB99 and AB747, and the extent to which the Safety Element needs to be updated to address those requirements and/or to incorporate other plans by reference.

1. **What is the timeline for the County’s update to its existing Emergency Operations Plan? Will it overlap with this process?**

The County’s update to the OES EOP is anticipated to be completed before the end of March 2022. The County will connect the successful bidder with the relevant staff person in the County’s Office of Emergency Services to coordinate with them on the EOP, as it relates to the Safety Element.

1. **In relation to AB747, there is no clear guidance yet from OPR and the State about how to implement this. Do you have expectations around methods to be used (budget concern for us)?**

We do not have expectations around methods to be used to comply with AB 747. The scope of work under any bid response to this RFP should include provision of advice in relation to that.

1. **Task 1: Project Management, Meetings & Coordination, states that the Contractor’s scope will include, among other items: “Pay for all expenses associated with the project, including but not limited to meeting materials, translation, stipends and technology (e.g. access to tablets)”. Please clarify if the Contractor is responsible to pay “stipends” (i.e., travel expenses, etc.) for persons attending meetings other than the Contractor staff?**

This line item does not include responsibility for paying for travel expenses for persons attending meetings other than Contractor staff.

The only expectation for “stipends” is in relation to Task 4: Community Engagement Planning, where the contractor should include in the budget for that item “stipends for community participation in the project”.

Community Climate Action Plan Q’s:

1. **Task 6: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Analysis, says to “Review all consumption-based GHG emissions inventories relevant to the CCAP completed to date…”. What community-wide inventories has the County developed to date?**

The RFP Addendum corrects Task 6 to include all “sector-based”, as well as all consumption-based, inventories relevant to the CCAP and adds a link to a consumption-based GHG inventory prepared by UC Berkeley Cool Climate Network.

The County prepared a traditional sector-based emissions inventory in-house based on 2015 data. This inventory is included in the CCAP Implementation Status Report which was presented to the Planning Commission in June 2020 (see link in Exhibit B of the RFP). The County will provide the data supporting this summary of the emissions inventory to the successful bidder. In addition, the County has access to a sector-based inventory tool prepared by StopWaste acting in its capacity as the East Bay Energy Watch (EBEW), with technical support from PlaceWorks. This tool includes energy, BART, off-road and waste data for the unincorporated areas for 2005, 2010, 2015, 2017 and 2018 and provides spreadsheet pages which can be populated for subsequent years. The transportation data is blank because MTC doesn’t provide VMT for unincorporated county, and there are instructions in the spreadsheet to use HPMS instead. The tool also does not include data for water and wastewater as this information was not readily available to EBEW. EBEW applied this inventory tool countywide, including for all cities and the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. Potential bidders can contact Miya Kitahara at StopWaste ([miya@stopwaste.org](mailto:miya@stopwaste.org)) if you would like to view the EBEW tool or have questions.

For consumption-based inventories, the County is aware of the work prepared by the UC Berkeley Cool Climate Network, which provides an inventory of all San Francisco Bay Area census block groups, cities and counties: <https://coolclimate.berkeley.edu/inventory>. The County has not developed any consumption-based inventories to date for unincorporated Alameda County.

1. **The RFP says the inventory update should consider “life-cycle greenhouse gas (GHG) accounting”. Should we interpret the inventory request to include a) a traditional production-based inventory, and b) a consumption-based inventory too (that pulls in life-cycle analysis, where possible)?**

Yes. That interpretation is correct, including the notation “where possible” for b). The County will take advice from the successful bidder about the extent to which it is possible and appropriate to include a consumption-based inventory with life-cycle analysis, and whether and to what extent this can be achieved within budget. If it is not possible or appropriate in the opinion of the bidder to include this within this scope of work in this RFP, the County would require the successful bidder to in their proposal at a minimum address this topic in the CCAP update and provide recommendations to the County about what actions should be taken in future, if necessary, to address consumption-based inventories and life-cycle analysis.

If the bidder considers it is not necessary or appropriate to produce a traditional production-based inventory update in the scope of work for the updated CCAP, the bidder should provide an explanation as to why, and should provide recommendations about a proposed approach for how to account for, quantify and track (if necessary) GHG emissions reductions resulting from the updated CCAP.

1. **Task 6 calls for an update to the County’s community-wide inventory. Are you also asking for an update to your Municipal Operations GHG inventory?**

No. The County General Services Agency Office of Sustainability is separately updating the County’s Government Operations CAP (GOCAP). There is no requirement under this RFP to update the County’s municipal operations GHG inventory.

1. **In Task 6, does the County intend that any consideration of a life-cycle assessment cover only County operations, or should it also include the unincorporated area of the county?**

The life-cycle assessment should cover unincorporated community emissions only, not County operations. Those will be addressed separately in the GOCAP.

1. **The RFP does not include an explicit task for GHG reduction measure development (and quantification), which is typically a major component of CAP development, particularly given the challenge of getting to a “CAP 2.0” GHG target. Should we be including that as a subtask under Task 6?**

Yes, GHG reduction measure development (and quantification, as appropriate) shall be included in the scope of the CCAP update. Clarification has been included in the RFP Addendum that this should be included in Task 8: Prepare Community Climate Action Plan, Safety Element and Implementation Plan.

1. **There is no detail provided on the process that the County is expecting for the development and prioritization of mitigation and adaptation actions. Please confirm if this would be part of the consultant scope?**

Yes. We expect the consultant to advise on the development and prioritization of mitigation and adaptation actions as part of Task 8: Prepare Community Climate Action Plan, Safety Element and Implementation Plan. Clarification has been included in the RFP Addendum that this should be included in Task 8: Prepare Community Climate Action Plan, Safety Element and Implementation Plan.

1. **Does the County intend the analysis to include estimates (e.g., MMT/year) attributed to the various mitigation measures being implemented by the County and within the unincorporated area?**

The County will seek advice from the successful bidder about whether and to what extent it is necessary or appropriate to include detailed estimates and analysis of the contribution that each mitigation measure being implemented by the County is contributing to GHG emission reductions in the unincorporated areas. We do not anticipate this will be a major focus of the CCAP update.

1. **The RFP does not include a focus on mitigation actions. Is this because you are in the midst of implementing those actions? Do you want us to update your inventory and consider implications of the existing actions in the update?**

We anticipate the focus of the CCAP update will predominantly be on establishing new and implementable measures for 2022 onwards. We do not anticipate the CCAP update will include substantial focus on the implications and quantification of implementation of existing actions in the current CCAP.

1. **Does the County have analysis on the progress of the implementation of the 2014 CAP actions to date?**

The only analysis that has been undertaken to date on the implementation of the 2014 CCAP actions is the analysis contained in the CCAP Implementation Status Report (see link in Exhibit B to the RFP). This analysis is qualitative only, and was prepared based on interviews and written responses from relevant County staff.

1. **Part of the work identified in the RFP is the evaluation of current CCAP efforts, how does this fit into the scope?**

The County does not anticipate the successful bidder would need to undertake a detailed qualitative analysis of the GHG reductions achieved through implementation of measures under the existing the CCAP. It would be appropriate to include some reflection on what was achieved under the existing CCAP to date, but the County does not anticipate that this would include a detailed analysis against the anticipated emissions reductions that were identified for each measure in the CCAP. The focus should be identifying a new GHG reduction target and development of implementable measures the County can adopt to achieve that goal.

1. **Will the updated CCAP be incorporated into the General Plan?**

Yes. The current CCAP is incorporated as an element of the County’s General Plan. The updated CCAP is proposed to be included as an update to the General Plan to replace the existing CCAP.

General/ Other Questions:

1. **RFP references housing element – what is RHNA allocation and what is timeline/ expectation about how housing will integrate with CCAP/SE**

The County’s RHNA is quite high, requiring over 4000 housing units, compared to the County’s previous RHNA which was just over 1700. Because of a large number of competing priorities, the County is slightly behind in the Housing Element process. We are planning to release an RFP soon for consultant support to complete the Housing Element update. The timelines between the Housing Element update and this project will overlap. We are not sure how the projects will interact, but from a timeline perspective, they will be occurring in parallel.

1. **Unincorporated county has unique geography. Can you share the County’s experience so far in implementation of the CCAP, LHMP and Safety Element, and provide any advice for bidders about how these have been implemented in the rural areas of the unincorporated County?**

The existing CCAP focused on urban areas. We are anticipating that this CCAP update and the Safety Element update will include more attention to opportunities for climate mitigation and adaptation in rural East County, including for example, opportunities for carbon sequestration and the need to respond to increased fire risk as a result of climate change. The County has not experienced any specific issues implementing the Safety Element in the rural areas.

1. **What is the DIR Contractor Registration Number identified in Page 2 of the Exhibit A – Bid Response Packet?**

This is a standard provision on the County RFP template. The DIR number is assigned by the State Department of Industrial Relations to keep track of construction projects and make sure the contractors pay prevailing wages. This is not relevant for this project, as it does not involve construction.

1. **In Section 1, the RFP states, “The County intends to award an eighteen-month contract (with option to renew) to the Bidder(s) selected as the most responsible Bidder(s)…”. Does the County intend to award only one contract, or multiple contracts to more than one bidder (i.e., bidder(s))? What does the County mean by “most responsible” in the context of evaluating proposals?**

The County typically awards one contract to a lead bidder and the lead contractor may sub-contract components of the scope of work to one or more sub-contractors. However, we note the RFP does specify that the County reserves the right to award to a single or multiple Contractors.

The “most responsible Bidder(s)” language is standard in the County’s RFP template. There is no definition of this term. To understand what the County will consider in evaluating the bids received, please refer to the Evaluation Criteria in the RFP.

1. **Does the County have a current list of stakeholders and contact information that the contractor can access and build on for the engagement tasks?**

Yes. The County has extensive stakeholder contact information and will update, build upon and share those contact details with the successful bidder for the purposes of community and stakeholder engagement.

1. **Do contractor teams need to include a SLEB to bid on the RFP?**

Yes. The County requires that at least 20% of the contract price is paid to a SLEB. If a bidder wishes to submit a proposal that does not include a SLEB and they are selected as the successful bidder, the County would need to seek a SLEB waiver from the County General Services Agency to proceed to contract with that bidder. The County’s strong preference is for bids to include a SLEB. There is also a percentage score increase available in the evaluation process for SLEB status.

1. **Should bidders develop the proposal directly in your bidder packet (e.g., including County seal, headers, footers, etc.) or can we develop the proposal following our own format/style while drawing on the requirements outlined in the bid packet?**

You must use the provided bidder packet. In several sections however, the bid packet contains a cover page, and you can include pages in your own format or style under those cover pages. But you must use the County bidder packet.