1. Q: Does the scope of work reflect a “final design”?  
   A: The scope of work is for any work necessary to achieve final design of rehabilitation work, with an emphasis on structures identified in structures assessments performed in 2005 and 2006. If the estimated cost of the identified structures rehabilitation is less than $6 million, including all “soft costs” such as construction management, mobilization, etc., final design work for drainage improvements and track improvements is also to be included. Links to the structures assessments and track inspection are located at http://www.sccrtc.org/duediligence.html under “Inspection Documents”.

2. Q: Is RTC excluding consultants who performed previous work (environmental, structural) from responding to this RFP?  
   A: RTC is not excluding any consultants from responding to the RFP. One consultant who previously performed structures assessment work does not plan to provide a proposal for this work because they are busy at this time. The RTC does not have preferred consultants for any work that is solicited and all proposals will be given due consideration.

3. Q: Who is the Project Manager for this RFP in your agency and their contact information?  
   A: Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, is the project manager for this RFP. Email lmendez@sccrtc.org; Phone: 831-460-3200; Fax: 831-460-3215; Mail: 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA, 95060.

4. Q: Is there a list of those who have RSVP’d to the RFP and is it internet accessible?  
   A: We did not have a list of RSVPs to this RFP at the time of inquiry. The list of those who RSVP and attend will be posted on the internet at www.sccrtc.org/consult.html following the meeting.

5. Q: Have there been any geotechnical investigations performed on sections of the alignment in the last 30 years?  
   A: The rail line is currently still owned by Union Pacific (UP), and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) does not know whether any geotechnical investigations on sections of the alignment have been performed in the last 30 years.

6. Q: Will the consultant need to list every person imaginable or just key staff in the proposal? Are rates negotiable or will RTC pay actual rates?
A: Only the key people need to be listed. The fee proposal will not be opened until a preferred consultant is selected. After that, final rates will be negotiated with the preferred consultant.

7. Q: The scope of services appears to include a significant amount of work. Is only $300,000 available for this contract?
   A: A significant amount of work has already been done through the previously completed structures assessments and inspections. The final engineering required is primarily for rehabilitation of existing structures, at the existing footprint, on the existing right-of-way, and the vast majority of the rehabilitation work required has been identified in the past structures assessment work. Therefore, the level of engineering work for this contract is not anticipated to be significant. In addition, operating freight railroads that are performing rehabilitation work on existing facilities do not have to meet the same level of environmental and permitting requirements that other projects must meet. The RTC is interested in hiring verifiable good people with appropriate experience and skills who will do good quality work at a reasonable price. Therefore, if the reasonable price for the good quality work solicited in this RFP for this project is not $300,000, provide a proposal at the price which your firm believes is fair.

8. Q: To what degree has preliminary design work been completed for the bridges and structures beyond the Structural Assessments?
   A: The extent of the work completed for the bridges is contained in the structures assessments produced in 2005 and 2006. There was also a peer review of the 2006 structures assessment. For some individual structures over 80 pages of information is available. Links to the structures assessments and the peer review are located at http://www.sccrtc.org/duediligence.html under “Inspection Documents”.

9. Q: To what degree has permitting been completed and what is left to do? Are there conditions of permits that need to be included in the final design?
   A: There has not been any permitting completed for this work. As identified in the Scope of Services, the selected consultant will identify and obtain permits necessary to proceed to construction.

10. Q: Will the selected consultant take the lead with public agencies in coordinating and permitting traffic, utility and other infrastructure improvements?
    A: Yes, the selected consultant would take the lead on any permitting requirements.

11. Q: What base maps are available? Are the base maps detailed to the degree appropriate for final design? Is supplemental topographic definition needed?
    A: 2007 aerial photography of the entire Santa Cruz County is available with resolution of 3 inches in the urban areas and 1 foot in the rural areas online at: http://gis.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/gis/map_gallery/. Although some of the rail line is not in the urban areas, all of the aerial photography for the rail line is believed to be at the 3-inch resolution. The Santa Cruz County GIS department has a digital elevation model from which elevation contours have been created. Valuation maps of the right of way are also available from RTC. It is not known whether supplemental topographic definition will be needed.
12. Q: Was the Draft EIR on the RTC website finalized as is, and are the mitigation measures shown in the draft to be incorporated in the final design?
   A: This question seems to refer to the draft EIR for recreational rail service between Capitola and Aptos. That EIR for that proposed recreational rail service was never finalized and that service is no longer being proposed. Any mitigation listed in that draft EIR do not apply to this project. The recreational rail service that is being proposed for this rail line will run between Santa Cruz and Davenport. A Notice of Exemption was filed for the purchase of the 32-mile rail line, the institution of recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport, and the rehabilitation work for which the engineering services are being solicited. A link to the Notice of Exemption is located at http://www.sccrtc.org/duediligence.html under “Environmental Documents”.

13. Q: What drainage analysis has been done for culverts and crossings? Has Santa Cruz County Flood Control specified improvements to be made as part of the final design?
   A: Drainage analysis has not been done for culverts and crossings and Santa Cruz County Flood Control has not identified improvements to be made as part of the final design.

14. Q: Are there utility upgrades to be included in the final design at crossings?
   A: No utility upgrades have been identified for inclusion in the final design.

15. Q: Is there a detailed cost analysis showing how the $6 million and $300,000 estimates stated in the RFP were developed?
   A: No, there is no detailed cost analysis. $6 million is the amount of funds approximately available for rehabilitation of the structures and any other work. This would have to include construction and “soft costs” such as construction management and mobilization, etc. In 2006, the estimate for the structures rehabilitation work including “soft costs” and seismic retrofit of one structure was $2.9 million to $4 million. That estimate was updated in 2008 to then market conditions to $3.9 million to $5.4 million. The $300,000 estimate for the final design work was based on conversations with consultants who performed some of the previous engineering work and others, who indicated that the cost would not be as significant as it is on other projects because this is rehabilitation work on a rail line with little activity, on existing bridges, at existing foot prints on existing right-of-way.

16. Q: Will bridge members identified for replacements in the 2005 and 2006 structures assessment be replaced with similar members or with members that would bring the structure to a higher design standard?
   A: In 2005 and 2006 when the structures assessments were done, the goal was to ensure that the structures would be able carry the freight load of about 4,000 cars per year, with 30-car trains at a 286,000-lb car weight rating, operating at FRA Class 2 and be serviceable into the future. The live load and longitudinal force analysis was done with this goal in mind and the replacement members were assumed to be similar to those being replaced. With the work recommended in the structures assessments, according to the analysis, the goal stated above would be attained with the exception of the Capitola trestle where the steel span over the Soquel Creek requires that the speeds be restricted to 10 miles per hour.
17. Q: Page 4, 2nd paragraph indicates that "The RTC has established a 1.9% goal for UDBE participation on federally funded portions of this contract." What portions of this contract are anticipated to be federally funded? A: Up to $250,000 of the contract is anticipated to be federally funded.

18. Q: Page 6, Proposal Format item 4: please clarify what is intended by the requirement for "a separate one-page chart of any sub-consultants, including identification of any UDBE firms, and their relevant expertise." Is a one-page organization chart graphically outlining the team roles, responsibilities and personnel for both the prime and sub-consultants on one chart adequate? Is it acceptable to provide relevant experience separately for each firm following the organizational chart? Is a two-page organizational chart required? A: It is acceptable to include the sub-consultants in the overall one-page organization chart, but that chart should include whether a sub-consultant is a UDBE and what expertise they will provide or work tasks they will perform. It is acceptable to provide information on the relevant experience of the team (including sub-consultants) separately from the organizational chart.

19. Q: Does purchase of the rail line have to close escrow before start of the design work? A: No delay in start of the work is anticipated, as the RTC anticipates closing escrow prior to issuing the Notice to Proceed. No state or federal laws prohibit initiation of the design phase in advance of ownership of the rail line. The RTC cannot start construction until ownership of the line. Sierra Northern would be cooperative in working with the design consultant to move forward in advance of closing escrow.

20. Q: How many rounds of review are anticipated? For highways reviews are done at several points and the number of reviews and who is approving impacts the cost and schedule. Who will need to approve the plans (cities, Union Pacific, Caltrans)? There seems to be flexibility in the number of submittals, such as preliminary, prefinal, and final. It is possible that peer review by one person is sufficient. A: The RTC anticipates that consultants will assist in identifying the review process. The operator and RTC will be involved. The extent of Caltrans involvement is unknown. They would likely be involved for work on structures over highways. Local jurisdictions may also review sections that cross their roadways. RTC plans to hire a construction management firm that will also review work done by the design consultant. RTC does not have experience doing capital projects on a rail line, so we will work together with the consultant to determine the best process, which is why it is very important to hire a consultant that is familiar with this type of work and knows what is necessary, what permits, what agencies to consult with, that freight rail lines are not subject to the same requirements as highway or light rail systems. We want to make the funds go as far as possible and ensure we are meeting necessary requirements and have sound infrastructure. Bridges are the highest priority.

21. Q: Page 10 of the RFP states that several attachments, such as exhibits required for state/federally funded contracts, will be required with the final contract. Please clarify whether LAPM Exhibits 10-O1 and 10-O2 are required to be submitted with the proposal or the final contract.
A The RFP has been amended to require submittal of LAPM Exhibits 10-O1 and 10-O2 with the proposal.

22. Q: Personnel resumes are not specifically asked to be included in the proposal. Can resumes be included following the project team organizational chart or would the RTC prefer they were included in an appendix at the end of a proposal?
A: Personnel resumes are not required, however, as noted in #4 on page 6 of the RFP, under “Project Team/Organization Chart/Staff Plan”, the proposal should include the areas of expertise, relevant experience and length of their work experience of personnel proposed to work on this contract. This could be included in the organizational chart, in supplemental information following the team organizational chart or as an appendix.

23. Q: I would like to obtain information such as county standard plans and specifications as well as project specific preliminary design engineering information necessary for submitting our application and for preparing proposals for such services.

A: We do not have county standard plans and specifications for the railroad structures that are part of this request for proposals. The work that has been previously done for these structures is located on our website at http://www.sccrtc.org/duediligence.html and is also addressed in question #8 of the question and answer list for this request for proposals located at http://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/11-07-08-rfp-rail-eng-QnA.pdf.

Additional information on the RFP, including notes from the pre-proposal meeting held on July 7, 2011 are available online at: http://sccrtc.org/about/opportunities/rfp/.