Responses to proposer questions received by November 21, 2025 at 5:00pm

Q: Could SBCCOG clarify the anticipated timeframe for completing evaluations once a project is received? Establishing this standard helps ensure that project reviews are completed promptly and that the COG's decision-making process remains efficient.

A: The South Bay Cities Council of Governments is requesting that proposers recommend a best-practice timeline as part of their proposal. SBCCOG recognizes that timelines vary depending on project complexity, document completeness, and the extent of required due diligence. As part of the proposal, consultants should outline a typical review schedule (including assumptions and dependencies) and identify any opportunities to expedite reviews when needed. SBCCOG's intent is to establish a mutually agreed-upon turnaround timeframe once a consultant is selected.

Q: Will the selected consultant be expected to attend SBCCOG Board or committee meetings to present findings or answer questions related to submitted analyses?

A: SBCCOG's governing bodies include the Steering Committee, which meets on the 2nd Monday of each month at noon, and the Board of Directors, which meets on the 4th Thursday of each month at 6:00 PM. Consultants should anticipate attending one Steering Committee meeting and one Board of Directors meeting per project. Virtual participation is acceptable. If additional presentations are needed, SBCCOG will coordinate scheduling in advance.

Q: For the risk identification component, does SBCCOG prefer a high-level "red flag" assessment, or a more detailed review consistent with institutional underwriting standards? Understanding the desired level of depth ensures that each report provides the exact level of scrutiny needed.

A: SBCCOG does not currently have the internal capacity to independently identify underwriting risks or red flags. Therefore, the consultant will be expected to provide a level of review sufficient detail for SBCCOG to make informed "go/no-go" funding decisions. This includes identifying red flags, outlining mitigations, highlighting key assumptions, and clearly explaining material risks to non-technical audiences.

Q: To best align with SBCCOG's budgeting practices, should costs be presented as hourly rates, task-based pricing, or a fixed fee per project review?

A: Budgets should include total anticipated hours per project, total anticipated hours allotted per task, hourly rate and any expenses (including additional costs such as travel), staff assigned to the project (with titles), and sub-consultants (if applicable).

Q: On page 4, the evaluation rubric notes cost of services and allocation of cost. Given the nature of this RFP, would sharing of the firm's rates schedule suffice?

A: The firm's rate schedule would not suffice. Please see the answer above regarding how the SBCCOG would like to receive the proposed budget.

Q: What is SBCCOG's preferred communication structure for ongoing reviews—email updates, scheduled check-ins, or use of a specific project management platform? We want to integrate seamlessly into your existing workflow.

A: The South Bay Cities Council of Governments prefers scheduled check-ins and email updates. However, the SBCCOG is open to the use of a specific project management platform that the consultant already utilizes.

Q: Is there a required or preferred report template for underwriting reviews, or may the consultant propose a format that meets the RFP's documentation and clarity objectives?

A: Consultants may propose their own reporting format. The South Bay Cities Council of Governments would appreciate receiving a sample financial evaluation report or template in the proposal to help evaluate clarity, organization, and level of detail.

Q: On page 4, regarding schedules, what specific aspects of schedule management in on-call underwriting projects would the South Bay Cities COG be most interested in understanding?

A: SBCCOG currently has two projects with immediate review needs. For future projects, schedule expectations will depend on the timing and complexity of each development. Proposers should describe their general approach to schedule management, typical turnaround times under normal and expedited conditions, key dependencies that affect review duration, and capacity to support multiple concurrent reviews. This will help SBCCOG understand how the consultant manages workload and ensures timely delivery.

Q: The "Proposal Requirements" section lists only two required sections—Cover Letter and Project Team Qualifications. However, the Evaluation Criteria references additional items such as Technical Approach, Project Management, Project Cost, and Schedule. To ensure our submittal is organized as you expect, could you please clarify whether you prefer:

Option A: All Evaluation Criteria topics (Approach, Management, Cost, and Schedule) included within the "Project Team Qualifications" section,

or

Option B: Each of these topics submitted as their own sections following Project Team Qualifications, such as:

- **Cover Letter**
- **Project Team Qualifications**
- **Project Understanding, Management & Approach**
- **Schedule**
- **Project Cost**
- **Appendix (Resumes + References)**

A: The South Bay Cities Council of Governments prefers Option B.