



1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• [www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
ALAMEDA CTC RFP NO. R20-0006  
ENVIRONMENTAL AND DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE  
RAIL SAFETY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

The following answers are in response to questions submitted by prospective proposers for Environmental and Design Services for the Rail Safety Enhancement Program, Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) Request for Proposals (RFP) No. R20-0006. This document provides the written responses to all questions that were received by Alameda CTC on or before March 13, 2020. Questions may have been edited for grammar and clarity.

**Q1. On the Reference Questionnaire form there is a required field for “Company name of the prime consultant proposer for this RFP”. Can you please advise how we should tell our references to fill in this field? I would like to avoid asking our references to fill in multiple forms.**

**A1.** As stated on the Reference Questionnaire, the company name of the prime consultant proposer for this RFP would be entered into the field; the proposer should ensure that the reference has that information. Further, as stated on the questionnaire, one form should be completed per individual key personnel. If you are asking one client to serve as a reference for multiple key personnel, the reference would need to complete multiple forms. Submittal of Reference Questionnaires to Alameda CTC is not required for proposal acceptance.

**Q2. If there continue to be health considerations across California and the Bay Area at the end of this month regarding the coronavirus (COVID-19), will Alameda CTC consider accepting proposals as PDFs/electronic files and not require hard copy submittals?**

**A2.** Alameda CTC has updated the submission instructions per Addendum No. 3 issued on March 24, 2020.

**Q3. How will the construction of projects be phased? Tier 1 first or by corridor?**

**A3.** Per RFP Appendix A (Required Scope of Work, Deliverables, and Staffing), “It is anticipated that the 56 crossings will likely move through development phases in groups of twelve (12) to twenty-eight (28) locations, and it is anticipated that the consultant will work with Alameda CTC’s PMT to strategize an efficient and effective delivery of the fifty-six (56) crossings.”

**Q4. 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?**

**A4.** Addendum No. 1 issued on March 6, 2020 revises the cover page of the RFP to include the link for the Reference Questionnaire.

**Q5.** 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.

**A5.** 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).

**Q6.** 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?

**A6.** 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.

**Q7.** Will you consider an extension of the Reference Questionnaire past the proposal due date for various circumstances that may arise with references?

**A7.** Alameda CTC has updated the RFP schedule per Addendum No. 3 issued on March 24, 2020.

**Q8.** Is column I (References) in the Resources Form required since we also have to provide a reference request form for Key Personnel?

**A8.** Yes, the Resources Form must be completed in its entirety as applicable and submitted with the proposal.

**Q9.** Do subconsultants need to provide reference sheets?

**A9.** 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.

**Q10.** 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?

**A10.** 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).

**Q11.** 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?

**A11.** 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](http://www.alamedactc.org/contracting-forms).

**Q12.** 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?

**A12.** Per RFP No. R20-0006 Section II.1.A, "... no proposer or proposed subcontractor responding to this RFP can also be on the PMO 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.

**Q13.** How much coordination has already taken place with stakeholder railroads?

**A13.** 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.

**Q14.** 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?

**A14.** 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.