

Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority
Railroad Service Optimization Planning RFP No. RFP201617-003

Questions & Answers

[Updated May 11, 2017]

- Q1. What are the terms of the professional services agreement that results from this RFP?
A1. This project is expected to take 6-8 months, but depending on specific tasks developed after final selection, the terms could be for as long as one year.
- Q2. What data are available to support the analyses required for this project?
A2. There is an extensive history of Amtrak OTP and delay data as well as ridership data to support different analyses. However, there are some categories of data that may not be readily available, for example, connecting bus ridership data. It is also possible to work with Caltrans/CalSTA to generate new ridership data estimates based on projected schedules that could result from service optimization.
- Q3. Is there any geographic focus for this project?
A3. No, we are looking for service optimization for the entire Capitol Corridor service area as well as for connecting rail services such as ACE and the Amtrak San Joaquins.
- Q4. What is the timeframe of the optimization strategies that you're looking for in this project?
A4. We are mostly looking for near-term (2-5 years) operations service optimization strategies that can be implemented relatively easily, however, there are certain strategies, such as renegotiating the agreement with Union Pacific Railroad for train slot usage, that have long-term impacts but that could be started in the near-term that can still be considered as part of this service optimization project. Also, identification of small level capital projects (e.g., crossovers, second mainline or siding tracks) that might achieve big benefits if implemented with a service optimization plan.
- Q5. How much ridership and revenue modeling is expected for this project?
A5. Some ridership and revenue modeling may be needed to support different aspects of this project, but these efforts will be supported in a separate effort led by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA).
- Q6. Will there be a Steering Committee for this project?
A6. Yes, a Steering Committee composed of CCJPA, SJJPA/ACE, and CalSTA will guide the overall project. Day-to-day project management will be handled by CCJPA.
- Q7. Do you expect Union Pacific RR to be involved in the project?
A7. Not in any significant capacity; if there are certain strategies that require their input, we will seek them, however, we are not looking for design-level approval from Union Pacific for this project. It is important to note that familiarity with Union Pacific operations and ability

to think from a Union Pacific perspective for different strategies will be very advantageous in this project.

Q8. Are there any CCJPA or other public documents that will assist with developing a proposal for this RFP?

A8. A document that may be helpful to consult would be the new 2018 California State Rail Plan that CalSTA is planning to release in May 2017. The themes of near to mid-term rail network connectivity and rail service optimization in the 2018 State Rail Plan is what this service optimization project is trying to achieve.

Q9. Does the entire proposal have to be in SF 330 format, including resumes?

A9. Yes, if not SF 330 format, then presented in a format that includes all the information required in SF 330 and in the same order.

Q10. Section J, 2, B on page 4 of 9 says: "A total of five (5) resumes are to be submitted per consultant firm (prime and sub distinct) and are limited to two pages in length per resume." More specifically, is the intent that there be a "maximum of 5 resumes per consultant firm", that is, 5 from the prime and five from each sub?

A10. Maximum of 5 resumes from prime and each sub.

Q11. The subject RFP requires the submission of 7 hardcopies of our Technical Proposal including a digital version. The Technical Proposal includes Exhibit 2 – Statement of Qualifications and Business References. This exhibit requires the submission of financial statements. There is also an "Open Records" submittal that does not include Exhibit 2.

We are a privately-held firm that consider our financial statements highly confidential, therefore, will the Capitol Corridor allow the inclusion of financial statements in the original hard copy and a certification signed by our Vice President – Chief Administration Officer certifying to our financial strength in the remaining hard copies and in the digital version of our proposal?

A11. The financial statements that would be submitted as part of the Technical Proposal would be confidential and not released to the public; these financial statements would only be seen by the RFP review panel, which consists of public agency staff. The only record that would be released to the public, at request, is the Public Records copy, which does not include the financial statements. We generally advise that the financial statement be submitted as a separate attachment to the Technical Proposal, if strong confidentiality is a concern.

Q12. What technical data will be made available from previous CCJPA/ACE/San Joaquin studies? Are there any operational models resulting from prior work which will be available to the contractor?

A12. The selected consultant will be provided all such relevant data if available. CCJPA does not own any existing operational model runs that would be suitable. If such models exist with other partners (e.g. ACE or San Joaquin), we would encourage those partners to share their model.

Q13. Are there DBE requirements or selection criteria associated with this RFQ?

A13. No

Q14. Is it possible to review the current JPA/UP agreement as part of the proposed service optimization scope of work (speaking in general of possible scope of work)?

A14. Yes. We would be willing to open up the current JPA/UP agreement if analysis shows benefits for all. That is one possible outcome of this project among many others.

Q15. Section D states a minimum of five (5) team members should be shown on the Organization Chart, however Section F states a total of five (5) resumes are to be submitted per consultant firm (prime and sub distinct). To be compliant, please confirm that we can include a total of at least now 6 each/per firm (sub and prime).

A15. Maximum of 5 resumes to be submitted per prime and per sub. The five team members shown on the Organization Chart can be a combination of prime and sub consultants.

Q16. Exhibit 1 (EXHIBIT 1 PROJECT CONSULTANT TEAM), with a section for Total Dollar Amount. Please confirm if there should be a separate sealed Cost Proposal or should this be included with the Technical proposal.

A16. We are not looking for a detailed cost proposal for this RFP. We recommend indicating proposed percentage of total cost in Exhibit per prime and sub(s).

Q17. The SOQ request has no mention of the standard Section G "Key Personnel Participation in Example Projects". Typically, this section shows the correlation between Section F. Please advise.

A17. Please include a section G "Key Personnel Participation in Example Projects" in the submittal.

Q18. Please advise if there is to be a full separate SF330 for our subconsultant, or shall we include with our sections leaving them to only complete SF330 Part II form?

A18. Latter approach would be preferred, with subconsultant key personnel resumes included with prime's Part I section.