



**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
ALAMEDA CTC RFP NO. R20-0002
ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE
I-680 SOUTHBOUND EXPRESS LANE FROM SR-84 TO ALCOSTA BOULEVARD**

The following answers are in response to questions submitted by prospective proposers for I-680 Southbound Express Lane Project, Professional Engineering Design Services, Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) Request for Proposals (RFP) No. R20-0002. This document provides the written responses to all questions that were received by Alameda CTC on or before August 27, 2019. Questions may have been edited for grammar and clarity.

Q1. I did not see a procurement portal to access the plan holders list. Could you provide me some assistance with this matter?

A1. Alameda CTC does not have a procurement portal to access a plan holder list. Per the RFP, prospective proposers are requested to sign up for optional email notifications of important updates regarding this RFP using the Email Notifications and/or Pre-Proposal Meeting Registration Form. The contact information, certification status, role, and services (provided and sought) submitted via this form will be published and posted after the pre-proposal meeting.

Q2. What is the estimated overall cost? Are union bids required?

A2. The estimated overall cost for the southbound express lane within the project limits is approximately \$250 million. Union Bids are not anticipated to be required but prevailing wage work is anticipated as a part of this RFP.

Q3. Prevailing wage is not applicable to our work, so we do not need to complete Exhibit 10-H4. If it may possibly be applicable to one of our subconsultants, then as prime, would we need to complete the 10-H4 as well? It is listed as required on page 32 of the RFP, so we are seeking clarification on whether it is necessary to submit if it is not applicable at all.

A3. The proposer is required to submit a Cost Proposal Form B for all costs, in addition to a Caltrans LAPM Exhibit 10-H4 (Cost Proposal – Prevailing Wages) for any prevailing wage costs, regardless of whether such work is performed by the prime consultant and/or subconsultant. Per RFP Appendix A (Required Scope of Work, Deliverables, and Staffing), prevailing wage work is required in the scope: “Consultant shall review existing utility information and perform potholing, including traffic control as required” and “Surveys performed by Consultant shall conform to the requirements of the Land Surveyors Act and the Caltrans Surveys Manual.” If prevailing wage is not applicable to the work of the prime consultant, but a subconsultant under the prime consultant performs prevailing wage work, both the prime consultant and such subconsultant are both required to be registered with the Department of Industrial Relations. Proof of such required registration for both the prime consultant and the specific team member holding the contractor’s license must be submitted with the proposal.

Q4. We'd like to know if Alameda CTC requires wet signatures for the forms and documents, or if electronic is acceptable.

A4. Yes, electronic signatures are acceptable.

Q5. For the References Form, it states to utilize one form per reference; i.e., for each key personnel, a minimum of three (3) reference forms should be provided. If Key Personnel have the same reference, should that reference fill out one form that accounts for all, or once for each key personnel individually?

A5. One reference form has to be completed for each individual key personnel.

Q6. Please explain the 70% LBE and 30% SLBE participation goals, of the total proposal cost or what factor therein?

A6. The 70% and 30% SLBE participation goals are based on the Total non-contingent proposal costs.

Q7. Who is the TSI Contract that Alameda CTC has awarded the contract to? For coordination purposes of this RFP, knowing who the TSI Contractor is would be beneficial.

A7. The TSI contractor for the I-680 toll system integration has not been selected at this time but we expect to have the TSI Consultant onboard prior to the completion of Task 3 per this RFP.

Q8. Per the RFP Project Delivery Schedule, does Alameda CTC intend to issue a future CM Services RFP in Q4 2021/ Q1 2022 for the oversight/ delivery component of this project?

A8. At this time Alameda CTC has not made a determination on whether Construction Management services will be procured or who the administering agency will be.

Q9. If this answer to Q8 above is yes, would a firm performing Subconsultant Engineering Design Services for the RFP at hand disqualify them, under the guise of potential conflict of interest, from pursuing the future CM Services RFP- albeit as a Prime or Subconsultant.

A9. A subconsultant under the contract solicited from this RFP may be disqualified from pursuing future CM services RFP as a prime and/or subconsultant pursuant to any potential conflicts of interest between the work performed under this contract and the work to be performed under the CM services contract.

Q10. The PSR/PDS was signed in September 2018. Almost one year has lapsed between then and now, and substantial new work may have been completed as part of the Project Report and Environmental Document in order to meet the anticipated public release of DED by fall of 2019. Will all this new work and results from field studies since the completion of the PSR/PDS be made available for review as part of this solicitation?

A10. At this time, no additional documents are anticipated to be provided. The Reference Material and scope of work provided in this RFP are to be used for any assumptions made by the proposing firm.

Q11. The consultant preparing the PA/ED documents currently has access to much more information than what covered in the PSR/PDS, which is the only document currently available for review. Is this consultant allowed to bid on this PS&E solicitation as prime, or be a member of another team?

A11. The consultant is not precluded from proposing on this RFP as a prime or a subconsultant.

Q12. There could significant differences between the PSR/PDS details and current project information. The fee estimate that is required for this solicitation can only be based on the PSR/PDS that is available for review. Can a proposer assume that the fee estimate will be adjusted based on additional information that may be available after the consultant selection is complete?

A12. Pursuant to this RFP, the scope of work and fee may be negotiated after consultant selection.

Q13. What coordination with local agencies is expected? – What elements will Alameda CTC lead and what elements will consultants be expected to lead?

A13. Some basic coordination is expected with local cities. There will be more effort required to coordinate with Contra Costa County and Caltrans. Alameda CTC will assist in coordination efforts but the consultant will be expected to lead coordination efforts.

Q14. Has the design level topo been completed for this project with Caltrans approval of submittals A, B and C? If so when was it completed?

A14. It has not been completed or approved at this time.

Q15. Does the design package need to be submitted for Caltrans Office Engineer (OE) review and final acceptance before RTL?

A15. Yes.

Q16. Will Caltrans advertise and award this project with Alameda CTC providing construction management services (via CM consultant)?

A16. No determination has been made at this time.

Q17. Were any supplemental work authorizations given to the current consultant to do any engineering work beyond the original scope of work for PA/ED, such as completion of design level topo and/or start of “At-Risk Design”?

A17. No.

Q18. Does any part of the “At-Risk Design” and supplemental work which may have been authorized overlap with the deliverables stipulated in this solicitation?

A18. No.