

Independent Audit Services RFP Topics for Audit Committee Meeting 2/17/21

- I. Proposed Changes to evaluation process:
 - A. Section IX. Consultant Selection-Best Value Evaluation Method needs revision
 - 1. The Evaluation Committee will conduct the Evaluation Procedures as outlined in Section IX(B)(1-4) in the RFP. The purpose is to determine all proposals that meet the minimum qualifications of the RFP.
 - 2. The Evaluation Committee advances to the Audit Committee the firms that have met the minimum qualifications.
 - 3. The Evaluation Committee must submit to the Audit Committee the reasons for any elimination of firms.
 - 4. The Audit Committee reviews the proposal documents, scores them in accordance with the provisions of RFP Section IX(B)(4-6), reviews the scoring of the Evaluation Committee and determines 2-5 firms deemed competitive that advance to oral interviews.
 - 5. The Evaluation Committee scoring of the statements of qualifications are advisory only to the Audit Committee. The scoring of the audit committee shall be the final scoring.
 - 6. The Evaluation Committee submits to Audit Committee proposed questions for oral interviews.
 - 7. The Audit Committee determines 4 standard questions for oral interviews. Follow up questions may be asked by the Audit Committee depending on the answers. Oral Interviews should be scheduled for up to 90 minutes each firm.
 - 8. The Audit Committee makes a recommendation to the full Board of Directors for selection of the firm to award the contract.
 - 9. The BART Board of Directors makes the final selection of the firm.
 - 10. Evaluation Committee Composition-One person from each department
 - a) Office of Civil Rights
 - b) Performance & Budget
 - c) IG Office
 - d) Accounting Manager
 - e) Procurement Manager
 - f) IT Department
 - g) Grants Department
- II. Proposed Changes to Section C Evaluation Criteria Minimum Technical Requirements
 - A. RFP Sec C(1)(c): The requirement of “at least three (3) public agencies each of which has at least \$100 million in active approved federal grants for each of the last five (5) years” seems a bit high and likely to exclude some firms.
 - B. RFP Sec C(1)(e-g): How is “agency comparable in size” defined for these questions?

III. Other

- A. Q&A Question 11 on the Q&A#1 doc: Performing work on site after pandemic. Staff replies to this question that remote work is ok while BART staff is remote. We should develop a better answer to this. Remote work should be allowed when feasible, even when BART staff returns. It will save us audit fees if we establish a new protocol now.
- B. Section 1 of the Agreement: Recommend we omit Chris Gann, and instead replace "Project Director" with "Audit Committee, or its designee".
- C. Q&A Question 24 on the Q&A#2 doc: This question was answered incorrectly. We should have referred them to section VIII (A) (4) of the RFP to clarify any issues they may have with the contract. This question is also like Question 3 of Q&A #2, which was answer differently.
- D. In the Agreement, section 5, language needs revision to require public hearing before the Audit Committee, followed by a 2/3 vote of the BART Board of Directors to terminate the contract for either cause or for convenience.
- E. Q&A Question 21 on the Q&A #2 doc: This question was answered incorrectly. It asked if BART had experienced any cyber breaches or data loses in the past 12 months and the answer said to see the response to #8, which was a question about SBE/MBE participation goals.