



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #010-003

ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE GAINESVILLE- HAYMARKET EXTENSION

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Below are questions with responses that VRE has received as of November 9, 2009 at 10:00 A.M. EST. Whenever possible, questions are presented as originally asked. Otherwise, the question is presented to capture the main thrust or idea of the question or inquiry.

1. In terms of implementing the project, does VRE have any thoughts as to what will take place beyond this solicitation and the associated timing?

The decision whether or not VRE will move beyond the phase of project development, which is included in the current solicitation, will be made by the VRE Operations Board. It is also contingent upon the provision of funding to continue project development (i.e., funding for final design and construction).

2. Since this project is based on a two-phased approach, will VRE issue two (2) Notices to Proceed?

Yes. Refer to Section 1.2, Paragraph A.3 of Attachment P.2 – Scope of Services.

3. Can VRE further clarify the sequence of events and timing following completion of Phase I? More specifically, if VRE exercises the right to advance the project to Phase II, how much time will the Consultant have between completion of Phase I and the commencement of Phase II?

If the decision is made by VRE to advance the project to Phase II, it is assumed that Phase II work will commence immediately upon completion of Phase I. A Notice to Proceed for Phase II would in turn be issued accordingly.

4. Should the Consultant prepare a cost proposal to reflect a two-year continuous cycle of work?

Yes.

5. Who will issue the Notice(s) to Proceed, VRE or DRPT?

VRE is undertaking the project and will issue the Notice(s) to Proceed.

6. Will VRE clarify how specific the Consultant should be in terms of following the guidelines established in the Alternatives Analysis (AA)?

No guidelines were identified in the Alternatives Analysis (AA) report.

7. The RFP requires Consultants to carry Railroad Protective Liability insurance. Does this requirement also apply to Subconsultants?

Railroad Protective Liability Insurance is required only upon request by VRE. Refer to Exhibit O.1, VRE Insurance Coverage Requirements. Yes, this requirement applies to Subconsultants. Refer to Section E.1, Paragraph B.

8. Section K.3, Paragraph D of the RFP states, "Reasonable proof for believing that any Offeror has an interest in more than one proposal for the work contemplated will cause the rejection of all proposals made by him directly or indirectly." Does this requirement prohibit Subconsultants from being a party to two (2) different proposals?

No.

9. Would VRE consider exceptions to Clause 39, Indemnification, of Attachment P.1 - General Terms and Conditions taken by Offerors?

Offerors shall identify proposed exceptions to the General Terms and Conditions under Tab 5 of their Technical Proposal for review and evaluation by VRE.

10. Clause 49, Labor Provisions, of Attachment P.1 - General Terms and Conditions, requires the Contractor to maintain payroll records for inspection purposes. Would VRE consider waiving the requirement regarding employee social security numbers?

Refer to the response to Question No. 9 above.

11. Clarify whether or not VRE permits Consultants to take exceptions to the clauses included within the General Terms and Conditions?

Refer to the response to Question No. 9 above.

12. Are financial statements required to be submitted by Subconsultants?

No.

13. Will VRE consider making the following two (2) modifications to the Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors included within Attachment P.4?

Attachment A – Company Information Questionnaire

With respect to Section 3.E, the Consultant shall not make this certification on behalf of its subcontractors because the Consultant does not have first-hand knowledge of the answers with respect to the subcontractors.

Attachment D – Certification of Insurance Coverage

The Consultant shall not make this certification on behalf of its subcontractors because the Consultant does not have first-hand knowledge of the subcontractors' insurance coverages.

No. Refer to Page 41 of the RFP, Paragraph b. of Tab 8, Subconsultants. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that lower-tier Subconsultants used in support of this RFP are in compliance with the certifications included in Attachment P.4 - Representations and Certifications, including all insurance coverage.

14. According to Resolution 9F-06-2009 (dated June 19, 2009) of the VRE Operations Board and supporting documents (e.g. Agenda Item 9-F) for this project, *“the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) approved \$3,250,000 from the DRPT Rail Enhancement Fund. Of the required \$1,750,000 match, \$1.5 million is being provided by Norfolk Southern. VRE is working to raise the remaining \$250,000 and will not issue the procurement until the match obligation is fulfilled or the Rail Enhancement Fund grant is reduced to an amount for which matching funds are available.”* However, Section A.3, Paragraph E of this RFP states, *“The estimated budget for this task is approximately \$2.5 million, inclusive of alternatives refinement, environmental assessment, preliminary design, and overall project coordination (including services to be provided by Norfolk Southern in support of the project).”* Therefore, if the funding has been reduced to a total of \$2.5 million and Norfolk Southern is still contributing \$1.5 million worth of in-kind services, then the project budget for the Scope of Services would be limited to approximately \$1.0 million, which is substantially less than the \$3.5 million originally anticipated.

- a. Have the matching funds of \$250,000 been obtained by VRE?

Sufficient funding is available to undertake the Scope of Services identified in the RFP.

- b. Have the Rail Enhancement Funds available for this project been reduced?

Refer to the response to Question No. 14a above.

- c. Have the matching funds contributed by Norfolk Southern been reduced? If so, by what amount?

The in-kind match provided by Norfolk Southern is independent of the estimated project budget identified in Section A.3, Paragraph E of the RFP.

- d. Clarify the apparent difference in funds allocated by the CTB / DRPT and those allowed by VRE, i.e. has there been an intervening event between the June Board meeting and release of the RFP that has reduced the funding available to complete the work?

Refer to the responses to Questions Nos. 14a and 14c above. The budget identified in the solicitation is VRE's estimate of project cost for consultant services to undertake the Scope of Services outlined in the RFP plus additional costs for supporting work related to the scope of services that will be conducted by Norfolk Southern (i.e., flagman for field surveys, signal system design).

- 15. Section D.1, Paragraph B.7 of the RFP requests, "Signed and sealed aerial and ground survey." With respect to "aerial," is VRE requesting a LiDar topographic survey or another form such as a photogramic survey?

See Addendum No. 1. There is not a preference. However, the Offeror's technical and cost proposal shall clearly indicate which type of survey is being proposed.

- 16. Section M.3, Tab 8, requires the Consultant to provide subconsultant costs in the Technical Proposal. This request seems to be in conflict with the requirement to separate the technical and cost proposal. Would VRE consider allowing subconsultant costs to be presented as a percentage of the total project cost rather than a specific dollar value?

Yes.