

# Countywide Sustainability Plan RFP

## County Responses to Proposer Questions

### GHG Inventory/Climate Action Plan Questions

#1 Is an update to the County's Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) part of the scope of work? And does the scope include revising GHG reduction targets for the unincorporated county?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Yes, updating the Community Climate Action Plan is part of this scope. The GHG reduction targets and all other existing County targets related to the topics in the Plan are open to revision during the planning process.**

#2 For the GHG Inventory, does the County want to use the same methodologies and emission factors as the 2010 Climate Action Plan or newer methodologies and emission factors that are used in carbon accounting today (to align with current international standards and carbon currency)? Please clarify if an activity-based/production-based inventory, consistent with the prior 88 cities and County inventory should be prepared instead of or in addition to a consumption-based inventory. Should there be methodological consistency with past inventories?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The County is looking for proposers to respond with a proposed methodology for the GHG inventory and Climate Action Plan. The details of how/whether to maintain consistency with past methodologies and/or inventories need not be resolved at this stage. Regarding municipal operations, the County is not necessarily looking for both consumption-based and activity-based inventories, but as stated in the SOW, will be informed by the selected proposer's recommendations on methodology. The County anticipates using the consultant team's expertise to advise on which methodology would be the best approach. That may include a new methodology and new emissions factors to align with the current best practice. The County does not have a definitive preference for a specific protocol and will be relying on recommendations from the selected proposer. That may require redefining the terminology used in the tasks.**

#3 Task 3.4: Will this task (develop indicators and targets) include GHG reduction targets?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Yes, developing/updating GHG reduction targets is part of this SOW. If a proposer suggests moving a specific indicator or target to another task, the County will consider that modification.**

#4 Task 3.4: Will GHG targets be for the county-wide region as a whole, the incorporated cities, the unincorporated county, or county municipal operations (or all of them)? And if so, will there be separate targets for each jurisdiction and region-wide?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County expects an ambitious regional GHG reduction target that the County will hold itself to and establish the framework for individual cities to use as well. The County Sustainability Plan (Plan) will not be developing targets for each jurisdiction through this process.**

#5 There is an existing LA County Community Climate Action Plan for the unincorporated County, but there is no existing “countywide” climate action plan and there are many jurisdictions in LA County, like Pasadena and Santa Monica and many others that have their own climate action plans. While the scope includes the preparation of GHG inventories for all cities in the County, it seems as if the climate action plan included in the RFP should be for the unincorporated County only, to avoid potential conflict with existing climate action plans in other jurisdictions. Please clarify the scope of the climate action plan.

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County is not expecting to receive agreement on a specific GHG reduction target nor on implementation measures from every single jurisdiction. As the question stated, municipalities within the County may already have a climate action plan and the County is not expecting to develop a climate action plan that overrides existing plans of other jurisdictions. This statement of work would establish a regional target with dis-aggregable data and a common accounting framework that, should each city decide to pursue, would result in a common accounting language for reporting purposes. The goal of this task is to provide a useful resource for cities that have not yet pursued such a plan or a means for updating existing plans should cities pursue it. The County has already begun conversations with cities and councils of governments currently developing climate action plans to identify efficiencies for County resources.**

#6 Task 3.4: If GHG reduction targets will be developed, does the scope include developing GHG reduction measures? And should these be quantified?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Yes, the scope includes developing GHG reduction measures including an updated community-wide and municipal climate action plans.**

#7 Is 1990 baseline GHG data available (SB 32)?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The 1990 baseline GHG data is not available.**

#8 Is the consultant responsible for completing the SCAG Grant forms and documentation?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The consultant is responsible for developing the content for quarterly reports and invoices. The County will be responsible for submitting the reports and invoices to SCAG.**

#9 What are the deadlines and requirements of the SCAG grant?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The greenhouse gas inventory work will be included for the timeline of the overall County Sustainability Plan. The requirements of the SCAG Sustainability Planning Grant allow for a much longer timeline, but the County will not be considering a longer timeline as the County Sustainability Plan will need the results of the greenhouse gas inventory before its completion.**

#10 Table 1, Task Summary for 3.2.1 (Sub-Tasks 2.1, 2.2., 2.3, and 2.4): Community GHG Inventories. These tasks include potential revisions to the previous 2010 inventories. Could the County please provide more details on what protocol/methodology was used to conduct these inventories such that we can estimate the level of effort needed for revisions? Could the County share inventory files? They are currently available to individual cities via LARC.

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County will not be sharing inventory files during the RFP process. More information regarding the County's past inventory can be found on the Community Climate Action Plan website: <http://planning.lacounty.gov/CCAP>**

#11 Table 1, Task Summary for 3.2.1 (Sub-Task 5.4): Outreach and Training (Meetings) Does the County have in mind specific durations for the meetings to conduct outreach and training? We know from experience that cities in the County vary greatly in terms of their size and resources, and we have heard from some cities specifically that they are unable to attend day-long trainings.

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County has not predetermined the length of time for outreach meetings or trainings. The County would anticipate that the proposers' responses would provide a recommendation as to an effective length of time. We would not expect that a full day would amount to an effective use of time for local government staff.**

#12 Table 1, Task Summary for 3.2.1 (Sub-Task 6.4): Unincorporated County GHG Inventory Files: The consultant will provide electronic files of each GHG inventory and BAU projection (disaggregated by local municipality) to SCAG and LA County in a manner that can be shared via email or posted on a website to support SCAG's regional data collection efforts. Please confirm that the County would like disaggregated data files for a total of 140 unincorporated communities in LA County.

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Task 6.4 does not require data files for the 140 unincorporated communities as they are not municipalities.**

**Scope**

#13 Please clarify the Statement of Work description that starts on page 12, and the Table 1 Task Summary that starts on page 19. The Table is almost exclusively focused on GHG emissions inventory development, whereas the SOW description includes a wide variety of additional elements.

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**“Table 1 Task Summary” is related only to Task 3.2.1. The County is not developing a Task Summary Table for the entire Statement of Work.**

#14 How do you view the County’s Water Resilience Plan and stormwater funding efforts intersecting with the development of the Sustainability Plan?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The Chief Sustainability Office, on behalf of the Chief Executive Officer, is a co-lead of the Water Resilience Plan. While we cannot comment on a potential stormwater funding measure, we do anticipate alignment between the County’s Water Resilience Plan and the water chapter of the Plan.**

#15 Is the intent to develop a Sustainability that includes the participation and approval of all cities in the County, or rather to set an example through a plan to be implemented in the unincorporated County that also identifies how the County will support the cities in their separate efforts? Is the Sustainability Plan meant to focus primarily on County departments or is it intended to be a more comprehensive plan for all agencies and stakeholders operating within Los Angeles County? What do you expect the relationship of your plan will be with other existing local sustainability plans?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**As stated in the RFP, the Plan is meant to be regional and comprehensive. The Plan will factor in the degree to which the County plays a direct, indirect, or supportive role over the issues in the plan. This Plan may be more aggressive than existing local sustainability plans, but will not take the place of existing plans for other municipalities. A central purpose of the County authoring a regional plan is to provide a useful resource to the dozens of municipalities that do not have sustainability plans, not to change existing plans. The Board of Supervisors will provide the final approval of the Plan and local governments across the county will be encouraged to use the framework and accounting in the Plan to adopt their own plan.**

#16 Task 3.1: Is Global Green’s “framework analysis” assessment available for review by proposers?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**No, we have not released the assessment publicly. That material will be shared with the selected contractor after responses to the RFP are received.**

#17 Task 3.2; Climate: Can you provide more detail or explanation on what you are looking for with regard to collecting data/trends for “Social/environmental/infrastructure vulnerability Countywide”? Are you asking the proposer to conduct a comprehensive vulnerability assessment for the County, or to collect data from existing studies and assessments?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The SOW is not requesting a comprehensive vulnerability assessment. It is possible that a comprehensive vulnerability assessment may be a recommended next step. Collecting data from existing studies and assessments to inform a description of the general magnitude of social, environmental, and/or infrastructure vulnerability would fulfill the SOW.**

#18 Can you provide a copy of the assessment work that was completed by Global Green?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**This assessment work was developed for internal briefing purposes.**

#19 Are Global Green intended to be independent from the project or can they be on a project team?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Global Green may not serve on any project team responding to this RFP. Global Green is strategically advising the Chief Sustainability Office in another capacity related to the County Sustainability Plan.**

#20 Can you provide a copy of any grant applications/proposals that have been submitted whose scope of work is included with the proposed scope for the Sustainability Plan (e.g. SCAG grant application for updating GHG emissions for cities)?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Table 1 Task Summary is the content of the funded grant application submitted to the SCAG’s Sustainability Planning Grant program.**

#21 What role is anticipated for the consultant to have in engaging the 88 cities in the County? The current SOW does not identify government relations as a task.

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The bulk of the effort to engage cities will be covered by County staff. The consultant’s role with engaging cities will largely be nested under Tasks 2, 3, and 6, but the County is not looking for government relations as core task of the consultant.**

#22 Do translation services need to be accounted for during the engagement process and if so which languages?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Yes, translation services should be included. The language provided would need to be in the context of the community being reached at the particular meeting. The County anticipates each meeting would require translation for at least one language. Proposers may provide pricing information for an additional language(s). Meetings may also be held in a non-English language and English may be the translated language depending on the community.**

#23 What is the planning horizon for the Sustainability Plan?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The planning horizon for the Plan has not yet been established. Potential horizon years discussed thus far include 2035, 2040, and 2050.**

#24 What is the base year for the Plan?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The base year for the Plan has not yet been established. The County anticipates that the data collection process may require varying base years.**

#25 How is the County defining “Green Jobs?”

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The County expects definition of key terms to be completed during the Plan process. Those key terms would be informed by the selected consultant team and, if appropriate, stakeholders. We may use an existing definition created by another agency such as the state Economic Development Department.**

#26 To what extent would LA County like equity to be addressed in the plan and planning process? Should equity be addressed mainly through an environmental lens or is it broader in scope?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Please refer to the RFP and the slides from the webinar. The County will include equity in each of the Plan chapters and will have equity as a core component of the Plan.**

#27 What is the process that has to be followed for plan development and approval?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The tasks listed in the RFP are the plan development and approval process. The details of internally vetting will be conducted by the Chief Sustainability Office.**

#28 Regarding the Funding & Finance does this involve on cost benefit analysis or looking to find actually grants and subsidies for projects?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County expects team proposer to include in their response the approach that they feel would respond to the need outlined in the SOW. We are not necessarily looking for a cost-benefit analysis nor just a list of potential grants.**

#29 Can the County share its recently completed “assessment of the alignment of County authority and current policies and programs with the three dimensions of sustainability (equity, environment, economy) and with various established sustainability topic areas” and relevant background research?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The Chief Sustainability Office internally assessed existing County sustainability actions and cross referenced that assessment with best practices for sustainability plans. That background work is currently internal and will not be released during this RFP process.**

#30 How did the County identify the “areas of greatest potential for direct involvement,” as listed on page 2 of Attachment B? Can you provide more information on this background work?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**See previous response to question #29.**

#31 Which indicators does the County currently measure and/or track?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County 2016 Strategic Plan largely outlines the types and categories of existing metrics being tracked. Other indicators may be tracked by individual departments, but are not necessarily all consolidated in one, publicly accessible place. Information about the Strategic Plan can be found at this link: <http://www.lacounty.gov/county-strategic-plan>**

#32 To what extent will the Plan focus on community vs. County vs. municipal government (cities within the County) sustainability actions?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The Plan will set goals and targets to apply countywide, which will require efforts from many types of stakeholders to achieve. The Plan will not focus on individual actions and will instead focus on scalable solutions that largely involve cities, the County, and other agencies.**

#33 What other plans does the County see as models for its desired outcomes from this project?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The Chief Sustainability Office reviewed plans from all over the globe and did not find any one model plan from a comparable peer in that other counties’ plans focused only on the County’s operations and/or their**

unincorporated areas. Other plans developed by regional entities largely focused on specific issues, such as transportation. These regional plans differ in that they do not take a comprehensive view like what the County has designed in the SOW. Some examples of city sustainability plans that use a similar comprehensive framework as what is proposed in the SOW include New York's PlaNYC, Philadelphia's Greenworks Plan, and Los Angeles's pLAn.

## Timeline

#34 What is driving the schedule of a public draft by July 2018?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**July 2018 corresponds with an internal deadline to develop a working draft.**

#35 The timeline provided in the Webinar indicated a Public Draft document was due in July 2018 and Final for Board consideration by November. However, the RFP states that the contract term is anticipated to be for a period of 18 months. What is the anticipated effort for the remaining 6-7 months?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The estimated contract period of eighteen months listed in the RFP allows for potential delays.**

#36 Can the timeline for the plan and planning process be extended or reduced?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**While it is possible to extend or reduce the timeline, the Chief Sustainability Office feels a sense of urgency to deliver this Plan to the region as Los Angeles faces major sustainability-related questions in the coming years. We recognize that this is an aggressive proposed schedule, so we do not anticipate reducing the timeline.**

#37 To allow time for teaming after the County shares the list of registrants, would the County consider extending the proposal due date?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**While we strongly encourage teaming, the County is not considering extending the proposal due date.**

#38 The contract lists a term of 18 months, but the schedule shared during the pre-proposal webinar shows the majority of work happening by July 2018 (public draft). This schedule seems challenging, given the magnitude of data collection and analysis required. Are you open to modifications of the schedule proposed during the webinar, or would a team be scored lower for proposed a more feasible schedule?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The County is looking for proposers to respond with their honest assessment of how to accomplish this set of tasks. The Chief Sustainability Office may begin data collection prior to the execution of a contract to expedite the data collection process. Submitting a proposal with timeline for**

**a public draft after July 2018 will not automatically be scored lower. Timeline will be considered as part of the Approach category.**

### **Minimum Qualifications/References/Proposal Materials**

#39 On Page 2 of Attachment A, Format for Proposal, under Proposer's References item 2 (b) asks for a listing of "all Public Entities contracts for the last three (3) years." Our firm has hundreds of public entity contracts over the last three years. Are you able to provide criteria that would bound this list to a practical number that would still serve the evaluation objectives of the County?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**You may limit the list of public entity contracts to the contracts most relevant to this RFP. The County suggests submitting ten contracts to help the evaluation committee review your qualifications.**

#40 On Page 3 of Attachment A, Format for Proposal, Under section V. Cost Proposal, the RFP indicates that "Proposals will be evaluated on total cost to complete all deliverables in the Statement of Work", and requests the "costs allocated to each Task in the Statement of Work", including Task 3.2.1, separately. Is there any additional information that the County seeks, and is there a default format the County would like us to use?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**During the proposal stage, there is no template for the cost proposal. The County would like to see costs presented in a way that allows the evaluation committee to understand the value of the proposal.**

#41 Attachment D: The Attachment states that the references provided should be for people/organizations where the same or similar scope of services was provided. Can you offer an example of what sort of work might be considered similar? Are you looking for a contractor who has written and helped to implement numerous Sustainability Plans?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**A proposer may provide references from any stakeholders who may have used your plan or from another project where your organization advised another organization. In general, proposers should submit references that they feel could best represent their abilities based on their experience with your organization on a similar scope of services. The County may select a proposer who has written prior Sustainability Plans.**

#42 Under minimum requirements, it states that teams must have 5 years of experience working on similar projects the size of LA County. This limits the responders to those who have worked either in LA specifically or on big city teams like N.Y., SF, etc. Is my interpretation correct?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The minimum qualifications are meant to help the evaluation committee evaluate whether proposers have the qualifications to handle a *regional***

planning process as complex as Los Angeles. To clarify geographically, working on plans for mid to large, urban areas would qualify. This requirement does not necessarily refer to the geographic size of any one city in a large region, but of the size of the complexity. For example, working on a regional plan for an urban area like Houston or Atlanta would also qualify.

#43 The plan to complete the \$1-2 million project by next July seems very aggressive considering contract approval, etc. will probably take till the end of the year. Is the County looking for a massive team to support the project?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Massive a subjective term, so responding specifically to this question is difficult. The County is looking for a qualified, innovative team. It is up to the proposers to respond with their recommendation as to how to staff their team.**

#44 One of our potential team members currently provides operational services to LA County. Would LA County be concerned of any conflicts of interest with this scenario if they joined our team?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Providing current services to the County of Los Angeles is not necessarily a conflict of interest. Situations would have to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.**

#45 Should we submit the forms in Attachments D, E, and F for each subcontractor or only for the main contractor?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Attachments D, E, and F should only be provided for the lead proposer.**

#46 Regarding Attachment E – Prospective Contractor List of Contracts: The listing must include all Public Entities contracts for the last three (3) years. Use additional sheets if necessary. Can we limit this list to the Public Entities contracts within the County of LA within the last 3 years or do we need to include all public entities? For a large corporation, a list of all public entities would be extensive.

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**You may limit the list of public entity contracts to the contracts most relevant to this RFP. We suggest submitting ten contracts to help the evaluation committee review your qualifications.**

#47 Can a team of consultants can meet the minimum requirements or does the prime or a single agency need to meet all three requirements?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The team may meet the minimum requirements together, but the prime should demonstrate as much of the requirements alone as possible.**

#48 Is there a page limit on the proposal or any sections?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**No, but the evaluation committee appreciates concise language and well-written proposals.**

#49 Would you consider a partnership between a firm and an academic institution?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Yes, the County encourages innovative partnerships that bring together a dynamic team to deliver a high-quality plan.**

#50 Attachment A.II.2.c Attachment F - Prospective Contractor List of Terminated Contracts. Listing must include contracts terminated within the past three (3) years with a reason for termination. Could we establish boundaries for this list?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**No, please list all terminated contracts.**

### **Dashboard/Website**

#51 Task 5: Will the dashboard be used as an internal tool (e.g. for staff) or external (public), or both?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The dashboard will be developed for public consumption, but will also inform internal staff.**

#52 Task 5: How does the dashboard relate to the project website (Task 6.2)?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The purpose of the project website is to share information, gather information, keep stakeholders updated, and provide a resource during plan development. The dashboard may take the place of that content after plan adoption.**

#53 For Task 5, does the County prefer ICLEI ClearPath tool?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The reference for ICLEI ClearPath is as example. The County does not prefer any specific tool.**

#54 The scope for Task 5 doesn't appear to include loading any of the data collected in Task 3 into the dashboard – is this correct?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County expects that the successful completion of Task 5 would be a functioning dashboard (see deliverable list under Task 5), which would include loading the necessary data points into the dashboard.**

#55 Is there a similar site that we can reference for the scope - number of templates and functionality?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County does not have a similar site to reference in terms of scope.**

#56 Will the consultant be managing the site?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**As stated in the RFP, County staff will be managing the dashboard site on an ongoing basis.**

#57 Can you list potential functionality for the site?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Gathering stakeholder input, reporting plan development activities, document progress, sharing upcoming events are potential purposes of the website.**

#58 Will we be creating content for the site?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Yes, selected consultant will assist County staff in developing content for the project website.**

#59 Is there a specific platform or language the site needs to be built in?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Yes, the site will need to be built on the Wordpress platform and will need to be cleared by the County's Internal Services Department. Please see [www.lacounty.gov/sustainability](http://www.lacounty.gov/sustainability) for our current website.**

#60 Are there any 3rd party integrations we need to incorporate?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**There are none required, but the proposer may include any recommendations in their response.**

#61 Do you have any idea about the amount of content for the site?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The core purpose is to inform stakeholders, so creating sufficient content to be a useful website for a regional planning process will be the standard.**

#62 Please confirm whether the cost of hosting an online dashboard will be covered by the County separately, and that the Consultant's role is limited to the design of the dashboard.

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Related to this task, the County will host the dashboard site and the consultant's role is to design the dashboard. The consultant need not budget for hosting costs.**

#63 Please confirm whether the website will be hosted on the County's server, and that the Consultant's role is limited to the development of web-based content.

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Related to this task, the County will host the project website and the selected consultant will help to develop the project website content.**

**Budget/Funding**

#64 Is funding for the project currently secured (County funds plus SCAG grant) or will the County require assistance from the team to identify and secure other grants or sources for optional tasks (ex. Task 2.3)?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**All the required tasks are funded. The County will not require assistance to secure grants for tasks listed in this RFP. Task 2.3 is currently listed as optional until the County receives notice of whether the already-submitted grant request is fulfilled. The grant will largely go to fund community-based organizations to expand capacity for public engagement, not the consultant team. Task 2.3 will be a small task in this SOW and is listed in the SOW to inform the selected consultant that there may be this additional work going on outside of this SOW.**

#65 What is the hopeful source of philanthropic funding for the expanded engagement?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The source of funding is a mix of local philanthropy and matching funds from Partners for Places.**

#66 Regarding Section V. Cost Proposal: The total cost must include all of the proposer's monthly costs, including but not limited to travel, telephone, clerical support, video and audio supplies, mileage, etc. Proposers must include the individual cost allocated to each Task in the Statement of Work (Attachment B). Is there a standard template to use for the cost proposal or how would you like the cost proposal presented?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County does not have a standard template for this SOW.**

#67 Regarding Attachment B: Statement of Work, Task 2.1 The County has identified a number of public/community meetings required in the Statement of Work, will LA County facilities and services be available to support these meetings or should all costs for these be included in the consultant budget?"

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Meeting spaces will be available at County facilities.**

#68 Are we allowed to budget for indirect costs? If so, is there a maximum that is going to be published somewhere? If no indirect costs are allowed, will LA County publish that information somewhere?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The Cost Proposal should reflect the complete cost of providing the services inclusive of direct and indirect costs. This RFP does not state a maximum for indirect costs.**

#69 What is the overall contract amount?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Please review slides from the webinar.**

#70 Could the County please provide a more detailed budget cap broken down by task beyond the \$1-\$2 Million overall cap described in the webinar? For example, public records show that the County has received a \$200,000 grant from SCAG for the GHG inventory element of this effort, but this amount doesn't include the budget that would be allocated for data collection. Can we assume that additional funds will be available for the data collection portion of the GHG inventories?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The \$200,000 from the SCAG Sustainability Planning Grants are only for the greenhouse gas inventory task of the data collection and additional funding within the estimated budget amount of \$1-2 million will fund those costs.**

**Other**

#71 If we sign on as a subcontractor for the planning grant, can we also sign on as a subcontractor for the implementation grant?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**This RFP is not a grant. We do not currently have plans for a second RFP related to implementation. Implementation of this plan will be carried out by County departments and will be overseen by the Chief Sustainability Office.**

#72 Can we use the County of Los Angeles logo in our proposal?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**No, the County logo cannot be used without permission of the County of Los Angeles.**

#73 Is the County interested in pursuing STAR certification as part of this scope of work or as a standalone effort?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County is not a reporting community within the STAR Communities Rating System. Pursuing STAR certification is not part of this scope.**

#74 What prior work has the County conducted on these topics (any published materials, consultants they've worked with), including a GHG inventory?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County has never had a comprehensive sustainability plan. The County has pursued over two hundred sustainability-related activities by a variety of County departments. Prior to the creation of the Chief Sustainability Office, the County's Sustainability Council oversaw such activities. The Sustainability Council includes the departments of Public Health, Fire, Sheriff, Public Works, Internal Services, Regional Planning, and Beaches & Harbors. The County has completed a municipal and community climate action plans.**

#75 For subsequent years, what level of ongoing product development do you envision needing under this RFP and contract? E.g. only support maintenance services to ensure uptime and bug-free operations, or bi-annual (or another timeline) of product enhancements to the toolset based on changing needs and customer feedback?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**We do not have plans for ongoing product development. Task 5 specifically outlines the requirement of delivering a product that County staff manages internally.**

#76 Do you anticipate having a plan that aligns with other frameworks or standards, e.g. the UN Global Compact, Future Fit, GRI, etc?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County is open to reviewing responses regarding which type of frameworks or standards the plan should align with. This SOW does not include hours for reporting to a framework.**

**Contracting**

#77 There is an exclusionary clause that mentions that issue - does "contractor's subsidiaries" mean subcontractors?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**No, subsidiaries does not mean subcontractors.**

#78 Could we apply as a stand-alone sub available to work with the prime awardee?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County considered this approach, but decided against it. No, this solicitation is only seeking proposals from the lead/prime proposer. Please contact other firms to team.**

#79 On Sept. 14, LA County hosted a mandatory webinar. Does this webinar apply to primes as well as subcontractors? Or primes alone?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The primary proposer is the only part of the team held to the mandatory proposers webinar requirement. Subcontractors are not required to have participated in the webinar.**

#80 Will a non-participating subcontractor on a bid, disqualify the entire bid, even if the prime and other subs attended the webinar?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**See previous response to question #79.**

#81 Please clarify the following RFP sentence: "In no case shall the Preference Programs (LSBE, DVBE, and SE) price or scoring preference be combined with any other county preference program to exceed fifteen percent (15%) in response to any County solicitation."

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Proposers will not be awarded preferences during the evaluation process from multiple preference programs and cannot exceed the 15% cost preference.**

#82 What are the LSBE, DVBE and SE goals?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**The County's current goals for utilization of Local Small Businesses, Disabled Veteran Businesses and Social Enterprises are not relevant for this request for proposals.**

#83 Is there a preference or benefit to teams that include SBE, DVBE, or SE business?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Preferences will only be awarded if the lead proposer is a certified under one of the County's preference programs.**

#84 Would the County consider any of its other certifications, such as the County's Community Business Enterprise (CBE) certification, for preference on this proposal?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**No, the County is not considering other certifications.**

#85 Is it possible to work with a firm that is currently not on your list?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Yes, only the prime needs to have met the mandatory webinar requirement.**

### **Scoring**

#86 Can you please clarify how the LSBE, DVBE, SE qualified sub-contractor will be taken into account in the scoring?

**COUNTY RESPONSE:**

**Subcontracts with Local Small Businesses, Disabled Veterans Businesses, and Social Enterprises will not be considered during the evaluation process.**

#87 Section 5, Exceptions to Terms and Conditions of Sample Contract and/or Requirements of the Statement of Work: Could the County please comment on what kinds of exceptions may make a proposal non-responsive? Are evaluation percentage points

meant to be assigned to the proposers' willingness to accept the Terms and Conditions and the Statement of Work?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Exceptions to certain Board policies, indemnity, and insurance policy, and key elements of the Statement of Work may be grounds to deem a proposal non-responsive. No evaluation points are assigned to a lack of willingness to accept the Terms and Conditions and the Statement of Work. Instead, non-responsiveness in that regard is a deduction from the overall score given by the Evaluation Committee.**

**Stakeholders**

#88 Who are the current list of stakeholders for the project?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The current list of stakeholders is substantial. The categories of stakeholder include but are not limited to cities, environmental organizations, business organizations, faith-based organizations, academic institutions, social justice organizations, community-based organizations, environmental justice organizations, regional governmental agencies, and the internal County departments.**

#89 Will the County help coordinate the stakeholder meetings and facilities for the meetings?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Yes, the County will be deeply engaged in the stakeholder process and County facilities will be available.**

#90 Are all County departments aware of the plan?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**Yes, the Chief Sustainability Officer is the chair of the County's internal Sustainability Council which represents all departments. The Sustainability Council (Council) has been briefed on the framework for this Plan and already provided input to its content. The Leadership Committee of the Council is made up of the department heads of Public Health, Fire, Sheriff, Public Works, Internal Services, Regional Planning, and Beaches & Harbors. These eight departments are the most central of the Plan development process. The Chief Sustainability Office is also the chair of the Council's Coordinating Committee which is made up of every County department's sustainability officer. The Coordinating Committee will also be contributors to the Plan.**

#91 Are there any other organizational dependencies?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The County has not identified any additional, but would be open to hearing any further recommendations in proposals.**

#92 How will this plan integrate, if at all, with the City of Los Angeles' sustainability plan? Are there other planning processes or programs that this plan would build on or integrate with?

***COUNTY RESPONSE:***

**The City of Los Angeles pLAN is already in the implementation stage as are other sustainability plans in several other cities. It is possible that the County plan be more aggressive than existing plans. Cities with existing sustainability plans will be key stakeholders to best inform County strategies. The other planning processes underway that would integrate with this plan will likely include the Water Resilience Plan and the Metro Long-Range Transportation Plan. There are many other existing County plans that will be integrated into the Plan.**