



Date: Thursday, February 24, 2022

To: Recipients

Re: Countywide Local Road Safety Plans
Questions and Answers **(FINAL)**

Q1. You refer to "qualified groups of firms" to develop the Local Road Safety Plans. Will multiple awards be made, one per County?

A1. SJTPO does not anticipate making multiple awards and certainly not by county. Efficiencies are anticipated to be gained by advancing all four counties together – in terms of data collection and analyses, the menu of countermeasures, as well as similar processes in each county. In addition, SJTPO prefers to have the entire effort managed under one consultant lead and one project manager. The references in the RFP to “consultant teams” and “groups of firms” are out of recognition of the fact that this is a large project that has many different elements, in addition to satisfying the DBE goal and as such SJTPO expects that proposals will be from teams rather than from individual firms.

Q2. Are Institutions of Higher Education invited to participate?

A2. Institutions of Higher Education are invited to participate. Whether as a primary or secondary firm, educational institutions, non-profits, etc. are welcome to participate. SJTPO has worked with colleges and universities in the past. Teams should carefully review the requirements of the RFP and contract boilerplate and ensure that all requirements are able to be met.

Q3. What is the timeline for completion?

A3. The timeline is generally to be determined by the consultant. However, a few things should be noted. First, time efficiencies are welcomed as long as they do not compromise achieving the objectives of the study. Second, as is discussed in the RFP, the expectation is that the project will kick off by July or August of this year. All work outline in Tasks 1-7 must be completed by June 30, 2024, with a portion of the ongoing support, described in Task 8, underway. The sooner that ongoing support begins the better. In addition, SJTPO anticipates extending the contract for one additional year to allow for continued ongoing support, through June 30, 2025.

Q4. What is the budget for this effort? / What is the expected budget for this work?

A4. In the Draft FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (www.sjtpo.org/upwp) there is a budget estimate associated with Task 23/403 Countywide Local Road Safety Plans. This project will be funded using federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds. Unlike other work identified within SJTPO’s UPWP, these funds must be approved separately, which allows an additional degree of flexibility in the available funding based on the needs of the project, as long as the funds benefit safety.

It is important to note that SJTPO’s expectation is that firms should address the needs and scope of work communicated in the RFP. The costs should reflect the workload and the benefit demonstrated in the proposal. Efficiencies that achieve the objectives are welcomed. Ultimately, the firm will be selected that demonstrates the best technical approach (40%), the best value given the cost (20%), with a strong team (30%), and satisfies the DBE/ESBE requirements (10%). SJTPO will then negotiate with the preferred firm and the budget can be considered further at that point in the evaluation process.



Date: Thursday, February 24, 2022
Re: Countywide Local Road Safety Plans
Questions and Answers **(FINAL)**

Q5. Does the funding amount noted in the UPWP represent the full award amount, or does it include a local share? If the latter, can you share how much the local share is?

A5. This effort is fully funded through the federal Highway Safety Improvement Program. As such, there is no local share. The budget amount shown in the Draft FY 2023 UPWP is an estimate, and the funding source allows SJTPO a degree of flexibility regarding funding based on the needs of the project, as long as the funds would benefit safety.

Q6. What is the SJTPO expectation for leveraging existing data versus collecting new/more recent data, specifically regarding pedestrian/bike data, since NJ is a pedestrian focused State.

A6. SJTPO would expect consultants to be familiar with available data and discuss this in their proposals. Utilizing existing data would be the preference, as appropriate. However, should the consultant determine new data is necessary the proposal should discuss this and appropriately budget for the data collection.

Q7. Is grant writing an expectation for ongoing support outlined in Task 8?

A7. Counties and municipalities regularly submit projects for various types of funding, including county and municipal aid, as well as other sources at the state or federal level. The intent was that ongoing support would assist them with applications and provide supporting documentation incorporating the systemic safety or safe system approaches resulting from this planning effort.

SJTPO is not directly familiar with all of the funding opportunities that counties and municipalities pursue, outside of the federal sources suballocated by SJTPO. Teams are asked to demonstrate their experience with county and municipal funding requests when preparing proposals and include and budget for any support that is assumed to be beneficial in advancing safety projects.

Q8. Will you be providing attendees a list of firms attending today's Q&A session?

A8. No, SJTPO will not be disclosing the names of firms or individuals attending the Q&A session.

Q9. Does SJTPO impose a page limit for responses to RFP?

A9. SJTPO does not specify a page limit on proposals. It is important to SJTPO that teams be permitted to freely demonstrate their expertise and communicate any necessary information about what they propose. This is a large, complex project with many elements that need to be adequately addressed. Firms are however, encouraged to be as succinct as possible, while being complete and thoughtful. Each proposal will need to be thoroughly reviewed by numerous reviewers.

Q10. Can you discuss DBE goals in further detail?

A10. As a federal project, only DBE and ESBE count towards the goal. SJTPO utilizes the most recent NJDOT federally approved DBE/ESBE goal, which is 13.23 percent. While there is language in the RFP regarding good faith efforts when a DBE/ESBE firm cannot be identified, as this is such a large effort, with many different elements, it is anticipated that teams can easily identify substantive work for DBE/ESBE firms, secure firm(s), and meet or exceed the DBE/ESBE goal. There are two links in the RFP that firms can use to verify a firm's DBE/ESBE status. If firms believe there is an error regarding their status or feel they qualify, they should reach out to NJDOT's Division of Civil Rights, who is incredibly responsive and helpful in supporting DBE/ESBE firms in addressing issues.



Date: Thursday, February 24, 2022
Re: Countywide Local Road Safety Plans
Questions and Answers **(FINAL)**

Q11. RFP Section 7.E Contracting mentions “...all state regulations and provisions of SJTPO’s prime contract with the NJDOT, the prime recipient of the federal grant, will be passed on to the consultant.” With NJDOT being the prime recipient, do firms (prime and / or subconsultants) need to be NJDOT cost basis approved? If so, it may significantly limit the potential firms that can be involved in the project.

A11. Firms are required to have a New Jersey Business Registration Certificate, as noted in the RFP. As to whether firms need to be cost basis approved, SJTPO cannot answer this question as it seeks a legal conclusion. The proposer must make this determination on its own or with the assistance of counsel.

Q12. Sometimes State agencies in New Jersey want to make sure that submitters have overhead rates already approved or certified. Is that part of this contract?

A12. A similar question was asked and answered above (Q11). Firms are required to have a New Jersey Business Registration Certificate, as noted in the RFP. As to whether the overhead rate needs to be audited and approved, SJTPO cannot answer this question as it seeks a legal conclusion. The proposer must make this determination on its own or with the assistance of counsel

Q13. Were any important pieces of information shared at the Live Q&A session that are not explicitly addressed in the RFP or in the Q&A that would be posted on the SJTPO’s RFP page?

A13. During the Live Q&A session SJTPO gave a brief high-level overview of the project before proceeding with questions from attendees. Two items were emphasized that may be of importance to also highlight here.

First, SJTPO is genuinely looking for consultant teams’ expertise in the proposals. SJTPO has not developed Local Road Safety Plans prior to this study. Within the RFP, SJTPO identified several objectives providing detail, based on strong examples, the NJ SHSP, as well as an understanding of needs in the region. Consultants are asked to review the proposal, understand the needs and desired outcomes communicated, and propose the best approaches to address those needs and outcomes in their proposal.

Second, SJTPO is looking for strong, organized leadership from the primary firm and particularly the consultant project manager to ensure that multiple firms and members of the team are well managed, and the project is not overly burdensome for SJTPO and jurisdictions.

Q14. Will the webpage and content be hosted on SJTPO’s website or will it need to be created and hosted by the consultant externally?

A14. SJTPO is able to host content on its website. SJTPO would envision webpages devoted to each of the County Plan efforts, possibly an overview page of the four plan efforts, and any other pages deemed appropriate by the consultant team. All content will be developed by the consultant team. SJTPO can provide a member of the consultant team with back-end access to SJTPO’s website to draft pages and page content for SJTPO review, edit, and approval. If consultant teams prefer website content be hosted elsewhere, that should be discussed and budgeted in the proposals. County websites would not be an appropriate option to host these webpages.



Date: Thursday, February 24, 2022
Re: Countywide Local Road Safety Plans
Questions and Answers **(FINAL)**

Q15. Will the consultant be expected to geocode the 15.04% of crashes that are not geocoded from 2010-2019 as part of this budget?

A15. This is discussed in more detail on page 19 of the RFP. First, proposals should discuss whether five or ten years of crash data will be collected and analyzed. This is important, not only because it determines the number of crashes, but also as the percent of non-geolocated crashes has declined each year. As noted in the RFP, 15.04% or 21,914 crashes between 2010-2019 were not geocoded, whereas 10.42% or 6,734 crashes were not geocoded between 2015-2019. Second, consultant teams will need to, at a minimum assess non-geocoded crashes against total crashes to determine if certain crash types or geographies are overrepresented in non-geocoded crashes. If there is a statistically significant overrepresentation in non-geocoded crash data, that may hinder the ability to adequately, accurately assess the risk associated with those crash types or geographies, then this would need to be addressed. Proposals would need to discuss how this would be addressed and shall budget for geolocating those crashes if that is the approach they propose.

Q16. Please confirm if proposed subconsultants are required to complete or provide the forms/certifications listed on page 6 of the RFP (letters L through O).

A16. No, items L through O listed on page 6 of the RFP do not need to be provided for subconsultants. Upon successful negotiations with the consultant selected for this study, the Prime Proposer will enter into a Subcontract Agreement with the South Jersey Transportation Authority (SJTA) on behalf of SJTPO. This agreement will be between SJTA and the Prime Proposer only; in no instance would the subconsultants enter into any agreement with SJTA or SJTPO. Any and all oversight of subconsultants shall be the responsibility of the Prime Proposer.

Q17. Items 3 (Mandatory Affirmative Action Language), 4 (Set Off For State Tax), and 5 (Required Affirmative Action Evidence) on the Proposal Check List are not mentioned on the proposal outline on pages 5-6 of the RFP. Please confirm where to provide these items in our proposal (e.g. in an appendix).

A17. All items listed in the Proposal Check List must be included in order for a proposal to be considered complete. While the location of items in the proposal package will not impact eligibility or scoring, Items 3 (Mandatory Affirmative Action Language), 4 (Set Off For State Tax), and 5 (Required Affirmative Action Evidence) may be placed at the end of the proposal package, after the Proposer's Completed W-9.

Q18. The proposal outline (pages 5-6 of RFP) suggest that cost information should be part of the technical proposal package. However, on page 13, there is reference to a "separate, sealed cost proposal." Please confirm that the former is accurate.

A18. The reference to a "separate, sealed cost proposal" on page 13 was included in error. All costs should be identified in the proposal.

Q19. The RFP notes on page 4, Section 1. Introduction, A. General: "These planning level efforts are intended to address the unique safety needs under county and local jurisdictions while contributing to the success of the New Jersey 2020 Strategic Highway Safety Plan." Question: Does the Local Road Safety Plan aim to address State roadways within the SJTPO region? Or only County and Municipal roadways?

A19. These plans will focus on County and Local jurisdictions. NJDOT oversees their own processes guided by the New Jersey Strategic Highway Safety Plan for the State system.