

## **Request For Proposal GCO Evaluation & Research Questions and Answers**

**1. Is an institution of higher education or a 501(c)(3) organization eligible to serve as the prime contractor under this RFP?**

A. Yes!

**2. Will ARC provide a Salesforce data dictionary and sample data extracts for Outreach Services during proposal development, or only post-award?**

A. The Salesforce Outreach Services Object Solution Design document available as a link under Exhibit D in the RFP as should suffice for proposal purposes. Actual data extracts can be provided post-award.

**3. For the Outreach Services Evaluation Tool and ROI Calculator, does ARC have a preferred methodological approach (rules-based calculator, econometric/statistical model, or hybrid)? Which emissions factors should be used for environmental impact calculations?**

A. No, ARC does not have a preferred methodological approach. This is left open to the consultant(s) to propose. For environmental impact calculations, a minimum of reduced CO<sub>2</sub> should be used, but NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC are also desired.

**4. What review and approval turnaround times should proposers assume for key deliverables?**

A. The project timeline is left up to the consultant(s) to propose, but all tasks should be fully completed by the end of the contract period (June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2027). Regarding review windows for key deliverables, the consultant should allow and plan for a suitable timeframe for an iterative review and refinement process. However, ARC does plan on being very responsive and expects relatively quick review times on its end.

**5. For required in-person workshops or presentations, how many on-site trips and how many team members should be budgeted?**

A. Per the RFP, a minimum of one in-person workshop is required for both Tasks 1 and 2, but the budgeting specifics are left up to the consultant to propose.

**6. Should audited financial statements be provided by the prime contractor only or by all subcontractors/team members?**

A. The Prime consultant only would be the one to provide audited financial statements

**7. Can the insurance and indemnification requirements be modified to align with standard university constraints?**

A. Intended submitters can feel free to make suggested edits to the Indemnification section #10 of the Contract Sample Boilerplate. ARC will work with selected consultant to agree upon final contract language

**8. Regarding Task 3, can ARC provide examples of previous engagements where outside consultants supported evaluation efforts? What types of expertise were required?**

A. The types of projects that might fall under task 3 for consultant evaluation support might include, but are not necessarily limited to: limited-time modal promotions (like Biketober); pilot or limited-time incentive programs for clean commuters; targeted marketing campaigns to attract new MyGCO app users; ad-hoc surveys; and/or service delivery and commute analysis for a specific employer partner. The types of expertise required for these program evaluation tasks include, but are not necessarily limited to: program evaluation planning; data collection; data analysis; statistical analysis; data visualization; narrative storytelling; survey design; and/or graphic design.

**9. The Scope of Work may involve the use of third-party or open-source software components that carry their own licensing terms. The contract boilerplate regarding ownership and rights in materials appears broad. Can ARC clarify whether (1) such third-party and open-source components incorporated into deliverables will retain their original licenses, and (2) ARC's ownership and usage rights apply only to project-specific code and materials created under this contract, and not to components whose licenses do not permit reassignment?**

A. ARC's ownership and usage rights will apply only to project-specific code and materials created under this contract, and not to components whose licenses do not permit reassignment. ARC will work with the selected consultant to agree upon final contract language

**10. The contract boilerplate states that ARC will have rights to all ‘documents, materials, data, and computer programs’ produced under the agreement. For clarification, can ARC confirm whether this provision applies only to intellectual property created specifically under this contract, and not to pre-existing intellectual property, tools, models, code libraries, or methodologies that may be incorporated into the work but were developed independently of this project?**

A. This provision applies only to intellectual property created specifically under this contract, and not to pre-existing intellectual property, tools, models, code libraries, or methodologies that may be incorporated into the work that was developed independently of this project

### **11. TDM-CP and team composition**

**ARC notes that at least one key project personnel at the lead firm must hold a current TDM-CP credential. Can ARC confirm that a TDM-CP at prime or subcontractor (e.g., TransAction Associates) who serves as Project Manager or Technical Lead would fully satisfy this requirement, assuming the prime leads tool development and analytics?**

A. Yes, a Project Manager or Technical Lead with a TDM-CP would satisfy the requirement.

### **12. Prior work relevance**

**For the ‘similar projects within the past five years’ requirement, would ARC consider combined team experience acceptable—for example, where TransAction Associates brings regional TDM program evaluation references, and Actionfigure brings large-campus and employer-focused TDM analytics work that is similar in scale and complexity?**

A. Yes, ARC would consider combined team experience.

### **13. Role of a software/analytics partner**

**In evaluating ‘experience, qualifications, and references,’ how does ARC recommend teams highlight the complementary roles of a TDM consulting firm and a software/analytics firm, so that the combination is assessed as a single integrated capability rather than as separate vendors?**

A. The presentation of contextualization of the experience and qualifications of the team are left to the discretion of the consultant within the proposal.

#### **14. Preferred platforms vs. custom tools**

**ARC indicates a preference for ArcGIS StoryMaps or Tableau for the interactive Fact Book, but is open to other platforms, such as a Tableau competitor and alternative Sigma Computing. What is important to ARC when thinking about whether ARC retains ownership, hosting control, and the ability to update data and content without vendor involvement?**

A. ARC currently has both ArcGIS and Tableau licenses, so using these platforms would allow easier handoff of ownership and future maintenance. ARC remains open to other platforms, but if used, the selected consultant would need a plan for the handoff of ownership and for ARC to make future updates, edits, and perform maintenance.

#### **15. Data sources and expectations for ‘new’ data**

**Does ARC expect the consultant to primarily re-use and update existing datasets from the previous Transportation Fact Book, or does ARC envision significant new data discovery (e.g., assembling novel TDM-relevant datasets or peer-region benchmarks)? If the latter, are there priority topics or indicators that ARC wants to emphasize?**

A. Per the RFP, “this update may include directly updating existing data from previous iterations; adding new data points and data sources that better speak to TDM efforts; and removing pre-existing data that is determined to no longer be relevant or useful. Specifics will be negotiated between ARC and the selected contractor.” Specifics can be proposed by the consultant and further refined post-award in the early stages of the project. ARC expects that, regarding datasets, the task will primarily be updating existing data, but will certainly involve some degree of data discovery.

#### **16. Depth of narrative and design**

**For the Fact Book, is ARC expecting the consultant to provide full editorial and design leadership (data storytelling, copywriting, and visual brand alignment), or will ARC staff take a more active role in shaping content once the technical framework and data visualizations are in place?**

A. Yes, ARC is expecting the consultant to provide full editorial and design leadership, but ARC will have support available for aspects of product design and brand alignment. And ARC does intend to take an active role in the development of this deliverable, working closely with the selected consultant at every step.

## **17. Accessibility and branding standards**

**Are there specific accessibility, branding, or platform standards (e.g., WCAG level, ARC web templates, ArcGIS Online constraints) that the Fact Book must comply with, and will ARC provide those guidelines at project kickoff?**

A. Both ARC and the GCO program have branding guidelines that will be shared with the selected consultant. Regarding accessibility, according to ADA Title II, all online materials must meet WCAG 2.1 AA specifications by April 26, 2027, so this will be required for the Fact Book.

## **18. Calibration data and historical records**

**To support robust modeling of outcomes (e.g., VMR, emissions, mode split) from TDM services, what historical datasets does ARC anticipate making available beyond Salesforce outreach records—such as past commuter surveys, employer case studies, MyGCO app data, or prior TDM evaluations, etc?**

A. ARC can make all relevant data available to the selected consultant post-award. This would include past commuter surveys, MyGCO app data, TDM Program Salesforce data, modal promotion evaluations, and all prior TDM evaluations.

## **19. Salesforce integration expectations**

**Should the outreach services evaluation tool be designed around periodic Salesforce data exports (e.g., CSV files) managed by ARC staff, or does ARC prefer a more direct Salesforce integration? Are there any security or IT constraints we should assume?**

A. It is left to the consultant to propose the way a user might interact with the ROI calculator, but direct integration is certainly possible. There are no security or IT constraints outside of those inherent in connecting to Salesforce.

## **20. Transparency vs. complexity of the model**

**How does ARC balance the desire for methodological rigor with the need for transparency for non-technical users? For example, would ARC prefer a model that is simpler but fully explainable to TMAs and employers, or a more complex model with stronger predictive power but more technical documentation?**

A. It is left up to the consultant to propose a solution that best navigates the pros and cons of these two poles, but in general, ARC desires a tool that has strong and well-documented

predictive power. It is not necessarily important that all users understand how the tool works but will need to be comprehensible (and editable) by relevant experts at ARC.

## **21. Ownership and long-term maintenance**

**ARC indicates that the outreach evaluation tool and ROI calculator will be owned and hosted by ARC. Does ARC envision internal staff maintaining model assumptions and coefficients over time (e.g., via an admin interface), or is ARC comfortable with a versioned model that is periodically updated under future task orders?**

A. ARC prefers that internal staff maintain and update model assumptions and coefficients over time via an admin interface since contractual agreements beyond the scope of this RFP cannot be planned for at this time.

## **22. Primary use cases and audiences**

**Among the two primary uses—(1) standardized program evaluation and (2) stakeholder-facing impact estimation—which audiences are most critical for ARC (e.g., GDOT/FHWA reviewers, ARC leadership, TMA staff, employers)? Prioritization will help us optimize the tool’s UX, outputs, and reporting formats.**

A. The primary audience for both Task 1 and 2 will be individuals working within the Atlanta Regional TDM program, which encompasses ARC, GCO, and the TMAs. However, both deliverables should be legible for a broader stakeholder group, especially the Fact Book, which can be utilized by individuals outside of the smaller TDM group.

## **23. Typical ad-hoc support examples**

**For the evaluation support labor pool (Task 3), can ARC share examples of the types of projects it anticipates—such as campaign evaluations, survey analysis, employer segmentation, or specialized accessibility/emissions modeling? This will help us ensure the right mix of TDM evaluation specialists and technical analysts.**

A. See answer to question Q8 above.

## **24. Coordination between ARC analysts and the team**

**How does ARC envision coordination between its internal evaluation team and the consultant for these ad-hoc tasks—for example, will ARC generally lead the evaluation**

**design and ask the consultant for targeted analysis, or should the consultant be prepared to scope and design evaluation approaches from scratch?**

A. In general, ARC anticipates it will lead most of the evaluation and design, with the consultant being used for targeted analysis and/or documentation. However, the scope could differ from project to project and can be negotiated post-award.

## **25. Asana project management expectations**

**The RFP notes that all steps, subtasks, and deliverables must be tracked in ARC's Asana account. Does ARC expect the consultant to manage the full task structure and updates within Asana, or will ARC provide a standard project template and maintain overall governance while the consultant updates progress?**

A. ARC will provide a standard project template and maintain overall governance. The consultant will be provided with a login and is expected to update progress on all relevant tasks in a timely manner.

## **26. CMAQ funding and audit documentation**

**Beyond standard time and expense records, are there specific documentation formats or audit protocols that ARC or GDOT prefers for CMAQ-funded projects, so we can design our project controls and reporting to align from day one?**

A. ARC will work with the selected consultant to determine frequency and template for financial forms should they be requested.

## **27. IP and reuse outside the region**

**For any generic components of the evaluation model (e.g., widely applicable TDM elasticities or templates), is ARC open to arrangements where ARC owns the specific implementation and data, while the consultant and/or software company retains rights to reuse de-identified, generalized logic in other regions?**

A. Yes, ARC would be open to an arrangement where ARC owns the specific implementation and data but the consultant is free to reuse the generalized logic in other contexts and for other clients. ARC will work with selected consultant to agree upon final contract language

## **28. Budget allocation by task**

**While the total available funding is indicated as \$800,000, does ARC have an expected or preferred range of budget allocations by task (Fact Book vs. ROI tool vs. evaluation support), or is ARC looking to the consultant team to recommend an optimal split based on level-of-effort and impact?**

A. The budget is left up to the consultant to propose.

## **29. Scalability and future phases**

**Does ARC view this as a one-time build for the Fact Book and ROI tool, or as a first phase of assets that might be expanded in future years (e.g., additional modules, deeper employer analytics, or integration with other ARC systems)? Understanding this helps us design architectures that scale cost-effectively.**

A. ARC views the Fact Book as a first phase or iteration of a document that can be periodically updated to reflect new data. The ROI tool is envisioned more as a one-time build, but should remain editable by ARC staff to reflect any updated assumptions.

**30. Is the intention for Task 1 and Task 2 to be developed concurrently or sequentially? How does ARC envision the two efforts being interrelated?**

A. The task timeline is left up to the consultant to propose. Both concurrent and sequential approaches are acceptable to ARC.

**31. Will any parts of the Fact Book (Task 1) be needed to be provided as hard copy documents, and if yes, what would be anticipated?**

A. No, the Fact Book will not need to be provided as a hard copy document, but in the design and execution process, it should be kept in mind that users may want to download and/or print out parts or the whole of the Fact Book. It is left up to the consultant to propose how to achieve this.

**32. Which organizations does ARC anticipate wanting to be involved in the stakeholder workshops?**

A. ARC has a pre-existing list of anticipated stakeholders that will be used for the workshop sub-tasks for task 1 and 2.

**33. Can you please provide a list of the data currently used by Georgia Commute Options, other ARC TDM initiatives, and local TMAs that will be made available to support Tasks 1 and 2, and the format/platform the data is sourced from?**

A. See Q2 and Q18 above. Further details regarding data sources, formats, and accessibility will be discussed post-award.

**34. In Exhibit B, rather than splitting out Direct Labor, Overhead and Profit, can we provide a Fully Burdened Rate for labor (including profit) along with Direct Costs and Travel line items (not subject to profit)?**

A. Exhibit B must be submitted as outlined in the RFP using the forms required. Any proprietary and confidential information should be clearly marked as such as instructed in the RFP.

**35. Will ARC publish a plan holders list, an interested vendors list, or host a networking event to facilitate teaming arrangements between Prime Contractors and specialized technical subcontractors for the development of the Task 2 Evaluation Tool?**

A. No, ARC does not plan to do this.

**36. With respect to Task 1, sub-task ii., and Task 2, sub-task i., is the stakeholder group already established, or does it need to be created as part of this work? Will ARC lead the convening of the group or is the consultant expected to lead?**

A. The stakeholder group is already established, and ARC will lead the convening of the group, but the consultant is expected to lead the workshops themselves.

**37. Are there target deadlines for each task?**

A. See answer to question 4 above

**38. What datasets will be made available to the consultant to support the work?**

A. See answers to questions Q2 and Q18 above.

**39. Will the consultant have access to Salesforce data?**

A. Yes.