

Pre-Response Questions and Answers
RFQ FleetMgt 10-2008
Car Sharing/Rental Pool of Vendors
for the City and County of San Francisco

Question 1: The RFQ introduction, as well as other areas of the RFQ, refers to rental vehicles, rental services and car sharing. Specifically, the introduction states, “Qualified candidates will make rental vehicles (as described herein) readily available” Since car sharing and rental car services are distinct and separate services, is it the City’s intent that car sharing organizations shall also offer rental car and rental services, and vice versa? How should a car sharing organization respond to questions that specifically reference “rental”, “rental vehicles” or “rental services?”

Answer: The terms “Car Sharing” and “Car Rental” are used interchangeably in the RFQ. The City will be “renting” vehicles by various increments of time, including hourly and units thereof.

Question 2: Is it the City’s intention to reduce their existing fleet and integrate car sharing vehicles to achieve the goals stated in the RFQ or maintain the existing fleet and add shared cars as an option for employee transportation?

Answer: The City’s objectives are stated in Section 3 of the RFQ. To that end, the City will consider any and all options including fleet reduction, fleet substitution, car share/rental integration, and other mobility alternatives.

Question 3: Section 3 (page 3), bullet point 5 uses the statement, “... through the right-sizing of vehicles...” Please explain the use of the term “right-sizing,” in this context, in more detail.

Answer: The phrase “right-sizing of vehicles” refers to the City’s desire to use the most efficient vehicle suitable for the purpose of each trip.

Question 4: Section 4, item 14 (page 5) refers to “carbon credit transactions.” Please provide further details on the types of programs the City would participate in with a qualified organization.

Answer: The development of carbon markets is relatively new. The City has expressed interest in quantifying and reducing its carbon footprint and may participate in various developing carbon market activities.

Question 5: Will the parking spaces be provided by the City and County of San Francisco? If so, how many will that be? Referring to Question #1 – What is the obligation if parking spaces are provided? How many employees are expected to use the cars?

Answer: The City may consider providing parking spaces with the exact number to be determined by negotiation. As a point of reference, the City could potentially provide 4 to 6 spaces in the Mid-Market/South Van Ness Corridor.

Question 6: In Section 4.7 – you refer to the City’s current costs – and note that the costs include liability, depreciation, parking and other related operating costs. Can you clarify what items are included in the “other related costs” category? Also do you have information on current utilization of fleet vehicles (i.e. how much per day is each vehicle in use)?

Answer: The approximate cost of \$7,364 per year for each passenger sedan includes maintenance and repair, fuel, administrative overhead, liability, depreciation, and parking. The average annual usage is 6,000 miles.

Question 7: In Section 5, you asked candidates to provide audited Financial Statements for the past three years and unaudited statements for this year. While we are happy to provide the City with this information, it is confidential to us. Is it possible for this information to remain confidential in the RFQ process? In general will information contained in the bids be available to the public?

Answer: A candidate should mark as “confidential” those portions of the Qualification Statement it considers confidential proprietary or trade secret information. However, such a designation cannot guarantee that the City will treat the designated information as confidential. In determining whether a record is public or is confidential, the City must follow the requirements of the California Public Records Act (Cal. Gov. Code sec. 6250 et seq.) and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (S.F. Admin. Code sec. 67.1 et seq.). The City must make proprietary financial information about the winning candidate public upon award of the contract, unless other State or Federal law prohibits such disclosure. For disclosure requirements generally, see S.F. Admin. Code sec. 67.24(e).

Question 8: In Section 6, the City is requesting legal liability insurance with a limit of not less than \$5 million. Our legal liability insurance is the usual and standard of \$3 million. Would you consider our standard insurance policy of \$3 million to be acceptable? Is this a strict requirement or is there flexibility?

Answer: The \$5 million limit is a strict requirement and responder(s) to the RFQ should have a plan to address any shortfall in coverage limits prior to any potential contract execution. However, depending upon the scope of any final resultant contract, the amounts and forms of coverage may be further negotiated to fit the anticipated exposures.

Additional Tips for RFQ Responses

- **How is an RFQ different from an RFP?**

A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is different from a Request for Proposal (RFP) in that respondent's qualifications to perform services are requested (such as resumes, references, descriptions of previous experience), rather than a specific proposal to perform a specific service.

- **Make it easy on the Evaluation Team**

Is your response easy to review? Is it concise, easy to find and understand, well-organized, and complete? Did you check for typos, spelling, and grammatical errors?

Did you follow the RFQ instructions regarding organization of the response, inclusion of the required information, etc.?

Does your response demonstrate that you understand why the City is issuing the RFQ?

Did you include all of the information requested by the City, including the RFQ Attachments?

Did you tailor your response to the specific RFQ beyond just repeating or paraphrasing the RFQ?

Did you take the evaluation criteria into consideration when preparing your response?

Does your response CLEARLY demonstrate that your firm/organization and personnel have the experience and capability to carry out the project with a successful outcome?

Responses are due no later than 2:00 P.M. PST, Friday, November 14, 2008.

Qualification Statements may be delivered in person to the Reception Desk at City Hall, Room 430 or sent via courier or U.S. mail to:

*Judy Wong, Supervising Purchaser
Office of Contract Administration, Purchasing Division
City Hall, Room 430
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102*

Please see page 11 of the Request for Qualifications for more detailed instructions.