



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ALAMEDA CTC RFP NO. R20-0005

The following answers are in response to questions submitted by prospective proposers for Program Management Oversight Services for the Environmental Clearance, and Preliminary and Final Design of the Rail Safety Enhancement Program, Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) Request for Proposals (RFP) No. R20-0005. This document provides the written responses to all questions that were received by Alameda CTC on or before March 10, 2020. Questions may have been edited for grammar and clarity.

Q1. I cannot locate the web link for the online reference questionnaire that we need to forward to our references. Can you please direct me to where I can find that?

A1. Addendum No. 1 issued on March 6, 2020 revises the cover page of the RFP to include the link for the Reference Questionnaire.

Q2. We are proposing a qualified team of professionals, and as such will submit client references accordingly. However, requiring clients to complete and submit a questionnaire for this proposal will severely limit the staff that are classified as “key” and may also impact a consultant’s ability to submit a compliant proposal. Many clients are reluctant to respond in writing to written request for information and in some instances are advised by their legal counsel against taking such a course of action. Respectfully, we request that Alameda CTC eliminate the requirement for clients to submit a completed questionnaire to Alameda CTC, and revise reference requirement to key staff references contact information (name, agency/company, email, phone number) for Alameda CTC review.

A2. We generally have not encountered issues with references submitting the questionnaire to us. We do, however, recognize that Reference Questionnaires are submitted at the discretion of the reference, and that references may be presented with challenges such as time constraints or availability. In part for this reason, Section II.3 (Proposal Evaluation/Criteria) states that a proposal that fails to include one or more items requested in Section II.2 (Proposal Content and Format) may be considered complete and generally responsive, if evaluation in every criterion is possible. Accordingly, omission of one or more Reference Questionnaires will not render a proposal non-responsive. Reference Questionnaires, if submitted by the RFP deadline, are considered during the Selection Review Panel’s evaluation as part of Criteria 4 (Staffing Plan and Availability) under Section II.3 (Proposal Evaluation/Criteria). There will be no change to the reference requirements as outlined in Section II.2.G (References) of the RFP. Requirements pertaining to key personnel are outlined in Section II.2.E.4 (Staffing Plan and Availability).

Q3. Please clarify if the References Request Form should be included under Item G. References or H. Forms and Certifications (per Table 3). Or do we need to show the same references in both sections?

A3. One set of Reference Request Forms should be included with the proposal as an appendix. RFP Section II.2.G (References) and Section II.2.H (Forms and Certifications) outline the requirements.

Q4. Will you consider an extension of the Reference Questionnaire past the proposal due date for various circumstances that may arise with references?

A4. Alameda CTC has updated the RFP schedule per Addendum No. 3 issued on March 17, 2020. Please also see Q2/A2 above.

Q5. Is column I (References) in the Resources Form required since we also have to provide a reference request form for Key Personnel?

A5. Yes, the Resources Form must be completed in its entirety as applicable and submitted with the proposal.

Q6. Do subconsultants need to provide reference sheets?

A6. If a member of the subconsultant firm is designated as key personnel by the prime proposer then a Reference Request Form must be submitted with the proposal for the identified subconsultant team member, in accordance with Section II.2.G (References), Table 3 (Required Forms and Certifications), and Appendix F (Resources Form). The Reference Request Form and References Questionnaire applies to any team member, including those under subconsultant firms, who is designated as key personnel by the prime proposer.

Q7. Please confirm if it is preferred to include resumes for the full team or resumes for key personnel only in the appendices?

A7. The proposer shall decide whether to include resumes in its proposal, including whether to include resumes for the full team or only for key personnel.

Q8. Would the required font size of 12 point and the 1” margin pertain to the resumes and other items included in the appendices?

A8. Yes. Per Section II.2.A (General Instructions), proposals must be typed with a minimum 12-point font and submitted on 8 1/2” x 11” paper with at least 1” margins, using a single method of fastening. The font requirement applies to all text except for charts, tables and graphs.

Q9. In reviewing the sample contract language, it appears the indemnity and the duty to defend is not in compliance with current CA Civil Code 2782.8 (January 1, 2018). Will the language be updated to be in compliance?

A9. Alameda CTC revised its form Professional Services Contract in 2017 in order to ensure consistency with SB 496, the bill that enacted the current Civil Code §2782.8. If a proposer desires to take exception to the terms of the standard form contract, the proposer shall submit its exception request(s) in accordance with the requirements under RFP Section I.2.A (Exceptions to the Alameda CTC Sample Professional Services Contract).

Q10. Please clarify which section of the proposal content the approach should be included in. The RFP lists two approach sections: 1. Understanding the Required Scope of Work section, a. “Succinctly describe the proposed approach for addressing the required work, outlining activities...” and in Section 2. Expertise, d. “Provide overall comprehensive approach for implementing and managing the full Scope of Work.” Considering the page limitation, please consider having the approach language exist in only one section to ensure a succinct proposal response?

A10. There will be no change to the reference requirements as outlined in Section II.2.E (Proposal Content) of the RFP. Proposers shall use their best judgment in addressing the approach under each section as described. The proposer shall clearly address each section, and may reference other sections of its proposal as applicable.

Q11. One of the requirements for Form 10-K is to have all required documentation required under A&E CONSULTANT FINANCIAL DOCUMENT REVIEW REQUEST, Caltrans form 10A. One of the forms requested is a Prevailing Wage Policy. As the services under this agreement will not be Prevailing Wage, is the requirement to provide a Prevailing Wage Policy excused?

A11. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) Exhibit 10-A (A&E Consultant Financial Document Review Request) does not apply to this RFP. Please complete all fields in Caltrans LAPM Exhibit 10-K and submit the completed Exhibit 10-K form(s) with your proposal.

Q12. Per Table 3 Required Forms and Certifications, Cost Proposal Form B lists: B1 Breakdown of Costs/ B2 Cost Summary/ B3 Contact Info by Firm/ B4 LBCE Participation/ B8 Unit Costs by Firm. The Form B (XLSM) that is located on Alameda CTC’s Contracting Forms webpage does not match what is listed in Table 3. Is there a different Cost Proposal Form B that we should be using?

A12. Under Addendum No. 2 issued on March 12, 2020, Cost Proposal Form B was updated and the revised Form B, which must be used as part of any response to this RFP, was posted to the Alameda CTC Contracting Forms webpage at www.alamedactc.org/contracting-forms.

Q13. Can you disclose a ballpark budget estimate for the PMO consultant portion of the work?

A13. We are not going to provide a ballpark budget estimate specifically for the PMO scope. The total program is currently estimated to cost \$65 million, including construction.

Q14. Can a subconsultant be included on both a PMO team and design services team? If that firm were to be on two winning teams, would it be appropriate if they then recused themselves from participation in one contract to not create a conflict of interest? Or, does the firm need to make a decision of one or the other in advance of proposal submittals?

A14. Per RFP No. R20-0005 Section II.1.A, “... no proposer or proposed subcontractor responding to this RFP can also be on the environmental and design services team for the SEP”. This language is intended to require a firm to choose which RFP it wishes to respond to. It is Alameda CTC’s requirement that a prime and/or proposed subcontractor (including any proposed subconsultant) choose to respond to either RFP Nos. R20-0005 or R20-0006, but cannot propose on both.

Q15. Is there an expectation regarding where the Prime Proposer PM will be physically located for the duration of the work?

A15. The main service of the PMO is to coordinate and manage successful delivery of the project. It is anticipated that the PMO will provide in-person services as would be required to meet that objective. In particular, the Prime Proposer should be available locally for regularly scheduled in-person meetings with Agency Staff, Partners, and Stakeholders as well as be available for potential field meetings including at the Alameda CTC offices and be available for conference calls.

Q16. Please clarify that it is Alameda CTC's intent to shift responsibility for the Utility Agreements from the PMO scope to the responsibility of the design consultant under Alameda CTC RFP No. R20-0006. It would be our understanding that the review of the Utility Agreements would still be the responsibility of program management under this RFP. Please advise?

A16. It is the intention of the RFP for the Environmental and Design Services Consultant to prepare the documents and for the PMO to review and advise on the Utility Agreements.

Q17. If there are fees for permitting or design review/plan check, who is the responsible party for payment of these fees?

A17. Alameda CTC will be responsible for paying these fees, either as direct payment or reimbursement as a cost to the project. It is anticipated that the PMO consultant will coordinate permit applications and permit attainment for the project with support of the Design and Environmental Services Consultant.

Q18. Please verify that Alameda CTC is responsible for payment of flagging fees?

A18. Consultants procured under RFP Nos. R20-0005 and R20-0006 are not expected to be directly responsible for Flagging Fees associated with the scope of work in the respective RFPs. At this time, it is Alameda County's intention to directly reimburse UPRR for these costs. Flagging fees related to construction costs will be determined through a negotiated agreement with UPRR during that phase of the project.

Q19. How much coordination has already taken place with stakeholder railroads?

A19. Stakeholder Railroads are aware of the program but have not been in receipt and have not reviewed the currently in process Basis of Design documents.

Q20. The RFP states the consultant shall prepare GO-88B application package and the PMO will review. However, the pre-proposal presentation slide says the PMO is lead on GO-88B. Will the PMO consultant host the field diagnostics meeting with Union Pacific/CPUC, or design consultant set-up. Who will prepare the draft GO-88B document? Please clarify roles of each for GO-88B?

A20. Per the RFP, the PMO consultant will manage all coordination activities of the project, including but not limited to; leading the Diagnostic Meetings, preparing and submitting response to comments received at these meetings, and shall be responsible for leading the GO-88b application. The Design and Environmental consultant team will prepare necessary documents, drawings and technical materials needed to respond to partner agency comments and the GO-88b application.