

Responses to Questions Received Regarding Gateway Cities Climate Action Planning (CAP) Framework Technical Consultant Request for Proposals

May 2017

In some cases, questions on related topics have been combined.

1. Considering that Long Beach is the largest city on the Gateway COG, how is the Long Beach COG CAP going to integrate and harmonize with the Gateway COG CAP?

As noted in the RFP, a condition of the CEC funding is that the CAP Framework be developed for cities under 150,000 population, which excludes Long Beach. Long Beach is preparing its own CAP and we anticipate collaboration with the City as we develop the model for the other Gateway Cities. It will be the COG staff's goal to work with the entire project team and the City to ensure the most constructive outcome for the COG member cities.

2. Most planning processes involves the general public in early stages in developing a CAP. Are there plans to engage the public during the development of the Gateway COG CAP?

The requested product is not a CAP, but a CAP Framework: a model or template from which member cities can develop their own CAPs when they are ready to do so. As such, we do not envision direct public outreach. The public engagement consultant retained through a separate procurement will be directed to work with cities that are ready to develop a CAP to ensure they have the tools needed to engage their residents. An additional goal for this consultant will be to identify best practices in public outreach to ensure other cities can build on the public engagement strategies used by these leading cities.

3. What are the anticipated or desired start and end dates for this project?

We anticipate that a contract would be approved by the COG Board in early August. The project would proceed for about 15 months from that date, with a final CAP Framework due mid-August 2018 and additional outreach by ILG in the three months following delivery of the final product.

4. Would the technical consultant organize, facilitate, or participate in the series of workshops at the COG office described in section II of the RFP? If so, under which task would these workshops occur?

The technical consultant would be expected to have staff at each workshop and present their current work products or proposed approaches, as appropriate to the current stage of the work. The technical consultant may be asked to contribute agenda items but would not be expected to otherwise organize the workshops.

5. If the recommended approach for the baseline inventory requires additional analysis, is the expectation that the consultant will conduct this analysis for each city? (Task 3.1) Please clarify if you are asking the consultant to conduct new baseline inventories for a new year, or review 2010 inventories and improve them to make them compliant with an established protocol, or just review and recommend improvements by listing additional data sources?

The proposals should include as much progress as possible towards providing a baseline community inventory for each city, given the available budget and existing data. The technical consultant will be expected to recommend a baseline year.

6. Will the CAP framework be adopted in a public process with environmental assessment under CEQA?

Since the CAP Framework is not a CAP but a template, it will not include emission reduction targets or adopted strategies. As such, the CAP Framework will not cause a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment and therefore will not be subject to CEQA.

7. We understand that this RFP does not include direct outreach to the public, but instead includes coordination with the public engagement consultant. Is it anticipated that the project team will participate in any meetings with the public, or prepare materials?

The primary responsibility for preparing materials related to public outreach will lie with ILG and other project team members. The technical consultant can expect to be asked to contribute to the preparation of such materials, based on the work products being produced. It is not anticipated that the project will involve public meetings.

8. What are the terms of payment for this contact (e.g., time and materials)?

This contract may be bid on either a time-and-materials or fixed-price basis, at the option of the bidder.

9. What format is anticipated for the cost proposal?

There is no specified or required format for the cost proposal. The proposal should make clear how many hours (or other costs) will be devoted to each task, what classifications of personnel will work on each task, and what each classification's hourly rate will be for the duration of the contract.

10. Page 4, "The CAP Framework effort does not envision direct outreach to communities; that would be conducted by individual cities when they undertake climate planning in a form suitable to their needs." Question: Will the consultant be expected to provide support to individual cities that undertake climate planning during the life of this contract?

No. That support will be provided by other members of the project team.

11. Page 4, "The technical consultant will not be expected to provide direct stakeholder engagement or public outreach services... However, the technical consultant will coordinate with the COG staff, ILG and the public engagement consultant to ensure that information regarding the CAP Framework developed to support the stakeholder engagement process is clear, accurate and appropriately geared to the target audiences." Question: Is there an expectation to participate in stakeholder workshops to support COG and/or ILG staff? If so how many?

Yes, participation will be expected as discussed in Question 4. Bidders should assume there will be four workshops during the course of the project.

12. Page 8, Project Schedule. Question: Should the proposed project schedule incorporate coordination with the completion of the Long Beach CAP document? What is the expected completion date? Is there an expected timeline and completion date for this project?

The timeline for this project is addressed in Question 3. The Long Beach CAP has a longer timeline; coordination is addressed in Question 1.

13. Can you elaborate on ILG's role for this CAP Framework project?

Please refer to the discussion of ILG's role as given on pages 3 and 4 of the RFP.

14. Under the target setting discussion, the RFP mentions that we should develop a recommended approach for public communications (in reference to target setting). Please confirm whether this is part of the scope of work for this project, or for the separate public engagement consultant instead?

Please see response to question 7.

15. Under the emission reduction strategies section, the RFP mentions that we should advice on which strategies may offer return on investment or a cost savings – should this be broken out into public and private costs/benefits?

All benefits and costs are of interest; the primary perspective of this project is the city perspective.

16. Is the technical consultant expected to coordinate with grant provider, California Energy Commission? Is there any reporting requirements that is part of the scope of the project?

The COG staff will coordinate with the Energy Commission (grant provider). The technical consultant could be asked to contribute to reports that are due to the Energy Commission, based on work products being produced.

17. 30 pages single or double sided?

Please limit responses to 30 pages of text, tables, etc., exclusive of cover page, table of contents, and full resumes of project personnel. Thirty double-sided pages would be sixty pages.

18. We wonder who is the incumbent for Gateways Cities COG Air Quality Action Plan?

The Air Quality Action Plan is a past project; there is no current incumbent.

19. No community engagement and/or outreach required by the scope, but supporting services to the public engagement consultant. Is there any timeframe for task, such after the project or during the project?

The technical consultant may be asked to provide input into the public outreach-related efforts by other team members at any time during the course of the project.

20. "The CAP Framework should be comprehensive in scope, addressing all elements of climate action planning and adaptation and taking into account related planning work by the COG such as the Strategic Transportation Plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. It must also include a means for the cities

to track and document the GHG emission reductions associated with their efforts.” Do we need to include resiliency/vulnerability analysis to the proposal?

To the extent possible within the available budget, resiliency/vulnerability should be addressed within the Climate Adaptation portion of the project (Task 4).

21. Will the selected team have access to the data, not the summary files but the numerical data for modeling purposes?

Assuming this is referring to data underlying the 2010 emissions inventory by Los Angeles County, it is not known whether this data will or will not be available.

22. Is there any goal and/or points for being as a prime and subcontracting certified small businesses?

No.

23. Footnote 2 on page 3 of 24 states that the CAP Framework will be prepared for all the member cities except Long Beach, which is too large to qualify. Should we also assume that Long Beach is excluded from Task 4, Climate Adaptation Tools?

Yes, although this topic, like others, will be coordinated with Long Beach’s efforts.

24. Have Energy Action Plans (EAPs) been developed for any or all of the Gateway Cities?

Four have Energy Action Plans and three are developing them.

25. Does the COG envision the model Climate Action Plan described under Task 3.4 as an actual CAP for one of the Gateway Cities, or as a model representing a generic city representative of a Gateway City?

The model is envisioned as being generic, not representative of any specific city.