

**Bidder Questions and Answers Matrix for
RFP No. 24-R07**

COUNTYWIDE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CATP)

| No. | QUESTION/COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|--|---|
| | | |
| 1. | Could the City please share the anticipated contract amount for this plan? | <i>This is a countywide planning effort covering all six (6) jurisdictions within Napa County. NVTA adopts a biennial budget which combines all countywide plans taking place during the upcoming budget cycle. This allows flexibility within the budget as we receive proposals.</i> |
| 2. | Is there a pre-proposal presentation you could share? | <i>There is no project presentation available.</i> |
| 3. | Is there a project budget and/or budget range for this scope of work? | <i>No specific amount has been allocated for this project. NVTA has various funding sources available from the overall planning budget to support this project.</i> |
| 4. | Please confirm in which section we should include our project approach and scope of work? We are inclined to include it in section 6 Examples of Public Sector Representation where the RFP requests we "describe our role in carrying out the responsibilities required by the RFP." Please advise if you would like us to include it in a different section. | <i>Please see page 14 of the RFP for the proposed Scope of Work for this project. Should a firm have alternative suggestions as to scope and approach, please detail those either in Section 6 "Examples of Public Sector Representation" and/or Section 7 "Staffing and Project Organization," as appropriate.</i> |
| 5. | Could you share to what extent NVTA and/or local agencies have GIS-based spatial data for the non-mobility features noted in Task 2.2 (e.g., short/long term bike parking, public restrooms, water fountains)? | <i>NVTA has an existing file geodatabase for countywide bicycle facilities, although layers have not been thoroughly updated since the 2019 Bicycle Plan adoption. NVTA also retains a geodatabase covering some countywide sidewalks and amenities, although</i> |

| No. | QUESTION/COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|--|--|
| | | <p><i>these data are older (~2016) and contain significant identified gaps. Local jurisdictions have varying levels of spatial data, most or all of which will require cleanup, ground-truthing, or collection of new data. Please see the existing Bicycle & Pedestrian Plans on the NVTA website for maps of identified facilities as of the adoption date of each plan.</i></p> |
| 6. | <p>Could you be more specific about what data and in what format NVTA and local agencies have related to the existing built active transportation facilities and previously planned active transportation facilities (i.e., are bike classifications by street in GIS or another form, sidewalk or pathway presence in GIS or another form or not at all, vehicle volume data in what format, vehicle speed data - posted or prevailing in what format)?</p> | <p><i>Building on the response to Question #5, bicycle facility GIS layers do include attributes for class (I, II, III, IV). Sidewalk facility layers do not contain attributes for width, and may not fully or accurately capture curb ramps, truncated domes, crosswalk striping, or other facility elements. We are not aware of any GIS data addressing vehicle volumes or posted speeds, although this data is available in non-spatial format from local agencies.</i></p> |