



To: All Interested Parties

September 19, 2022

From: Lisa Rheinheimer
Assistant General Manager
Monterey-Salinas Transit District

RFP 23-02 Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) for SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project

ADDENDUM 2

This Addendum 2 to the above referenced RFP responds to questions received as of September 16, 2022. The question is provided first with MST’s corresponding response. Other than those specifically listed below, no other sections, terms or conditions of the above cited solicitation are being altered at this time. All other sections conditions and language not specifically cited as altered in this document are still in full and original effect.

Notes from the mandatory Pre-proposal meeting including a list of attendees can be found in Attachment 1 below.

Question	Response
1 Page 18, 4.1.3 b. - This section states that proof of insurance and/or other financial resources shall be contained in the Technical Proposal. Does Exhibit A.06 satisfy this requirement?	Yes.
2 Page 19, 4.2.1 – Can 11x17 pages be used instead of 8 ½ x 11 if the 11x17 page counts as two pages? Can 11x17 pages be used for exhibits, tables, charts, and other graphical and illustrative information?	Yes. Each 11x17 pages will count as one (1) page.

3	Page 19, 4.2.1 - - The transmittal letter requires acknowledgement of receipt of all RFP addenda. There is also a form that has a signature for this. Please clarify if the form is to be included and where in the document it should be included.	Please indicate in the transmittal letter that all addenda have been acknowledged and complete the form provided.
4	Page 20, 4.2.3, a & Exhibit A.09 – Please clarify where Exhibit A.09 should be included in the Technical Proposal. Are all Forms/Exhibits able to be submitted in an Appendix?	All Exhibit A documents, including A.09, are to be submitted with the proposal and will not be included in the page count. Proposers are not precluded from including information contained in an Exhibit in the body of the Proposal, except for the Cost Proposal Exhibits. Proposers are directed to Section 4 for specific instructions on submittal of the Cost Proposal Exhibits.
5	Page 20, 4.2.3, b – Please clarify if Exhibit A.10 is included in the body of the Technical Proposal or if it can be included in an Exhibits/Forms Appendix.	See response to 4 above.
6	Page 21, 5.1.1 – Please define all positions that are determined to be key personnel.	MST will not further define key positions. Key positions will be offered by the Proposer that it considers key to successful completion of the SURF! Project.
7	Page 21, 5.1.1 – Please change CM/GC to CM/GC or other negotiated contract with a preconstruction phase.	See Addendum 1.
8	Page 22, 5.2.2 - Please change CM/GC to CM/GC or other negotiated contract with a preconstruction phase.	See Addendum 1.
9	Page 22, 5.2.2 – On the second line of this section please replace transit with transit/transportation to be consistent with the rest of the document and better capture the scope of work of the subject project.	See Addendum 1.

10	Page 22, 5.2.1 c.- Please define the term outreach.	No further definition will be provided. The form and extent of outreach is to be recommended based on the Proposers approach to construction of the SURF! Project and may be based on success of previous projects.
11	Page 23, 5.2.6 – Please clarify if the Reference Check is included as part of Exhibit A.09 or if we are to include it in the body of the Technical Proposal.	All Exhibit A documents, including A.09, are to be submitted with the proposal and are not included in the page count. Proposers are not precluded from including information contained in an Exhibit in the body of the Proposal, except for Cost Proposal Exhibits. Proposers are directed to Section 4 for specific instructions on submittal of cost proposals.
12	Exhibit A.16 – Please change the range from 5% - 10% to 8% - 12%. This range has been recently used by LA Metro as the range on their CMGC procurements. The low end of the current range is below what is traditionally used on hard bid projects and if a contractor elects to use the low end of the current range, it creates a situation where agreeing to a final price becomes strained and can lead to a failure to reach a TCP.	MST agrees to increasing the range to 7% - 11%.
13	Exhibit B.04 – Please provide a copy of the Construction Services Agreement.	MST will post the “SAMPLE Construction Service Agreement” by September 30, 2022.
14	Draft 35% plan set – The plan sheets (specifically the “C” plans) show design contours, and partial original ground contours but not within the new improvements. Please provide C plans that show OG within the new improvements.	The CAD file in the link below contains our EG Surface Model + Contours: https://kimley-horn.securevdr.com/d-s5a607411cea54e2188376604e60d41f2
15	It would be a TON of help if I could possibly get a DWG of the Existing contours and maybe even an XML of the centerline alignments.	See answer to question 14 above.

<p>16</p>	<p>We received the Addendum #1 for RFP #23-02. It is not clear to me if this was in response to my earlier email or not. As written, these changes do not make a level playing field, and our company will be very much disadvantaged. I'm hoping there is another addendum coming that will correct this.</p> <p>What we need is for the RFP to grant points to contractors with a demonstrated history of working collaboratively with owners to solve difficult problems building roadway projects. There have been almost no busway/BRT projects or CMGC projects in the greater SF/Monterey Bay region in the last ten years. Given that fact, it is impossible for a local firm to establish the type of prior experience the RFP currently requires.</p> <p>The SURF! project is for the most part, a highway dedicated to buses. If a firm does a good job working with owners to solve problems while building highways, they should be a great fit for this project. What I think you are really hoping to find is a firm with experience working well with owners and one that can solve the issues that are likely to come up on a job like this one.</p> <p>These CMGC projects are troubling for us because they are typically written in a manner where we can submit a proposal, we will just get fewer points than firms with extensive CMGC experience. I don't mind competing for work – we do it all the time – but I am not doing my job well if I dedicate significant company resources chasing projects where we have a</p>	<p>MST will not make additional changes beyond Addendum 1. Firms should understand that changes made in Addendum 1 were meant to recognize that CMGC is new to the Central Coast. Preference is given for previous experience delivering with CMGC but not required.</p> <p>The reason for choosing CMGC is the flexibility of a best value selection based on several criteria including experience. With CMGC, the contractor is taking on additional roles and responsibilities. It is reasonable for the implementing agency to consider and prefer a contractor who has relevant/related experience and proven success.</p> <p>If a contractor has great experience in working with owners and being local is a true advantage, they can make that case in their proposal. They also would need to demonstrate that as an organization and with the people assigned to SURF!, they can deliver as a CMGC.</p> <p>Contractors should show that they can do a great job delivering projects working with owners. Experience with delivering highway projects is a good example of a similar type of project.</p> <p>MST appreciates the time and effort that goes into submitting a proposal.</p>
-----------	---	--

	<p>disadvantage and therefore a low chance of being successful. Based on your phone call with us a few days ago, we have started the proposal effort. As you know, these proposals are a big effort from many people, and they are quite expensive.</p>	
17	<p>It was nice to meet you virtually on the call today – I realized after the call today that I noticed there was a reference to the Shelter design at 35% as a Semi-Custom shelter from another manufacturer. Are those designs included somewhere in the document?</p> <p>Also, is there then an approved equal process to allow us to quote the GC's on the shelters?</p>	<p>MST will post the "SAMPLE Construction Service Agreement" by September 30, 2022.</p> <p>Semi-custom shelter designs will be provided with the draft 65% plans package. MST has not determined if shelters will be owner provided or procured directly by the Contractor, further direction will be provided during 95% design phase, including whether approved equal manufacturers will be acceptable.</p>
18	<p>Doesn't look like the plans contain any existing contours within the actual work area. If we could possibly get the existing surface in some type of digital format, we would appreciate it.</p>	<p>See answer to question 14 above.</p>
19	<p>Page 35 of the RFP states: "The person signing the certification shall state his or her address and official capacity."</p> <p>Is this referring to <u>all</u> of the forms, or just certain ones? We typically do list a person's title, but don't always type our address unless required.</p>	<p>Please complete the information specifically requested of that form. If the address is not called out, there is no need to include the firms address.</p> <p>For example, Exhibit A.03 Certification of Restrictions on Lobbying does not include a section for an address and no address is required in A.03.</p> <p>However, Exhibit A.04 Bidder Form asks for the Firm Address and address information is required in A.04.</p>
20	<p>Section 1.3 The table for Key Project Construction Milestones (page 6) lists November 2022 as NTP for Pre-Construction Services and February 2023 as the target</p>	<p>We anticipate 18 months of pre-construction services.</p>

	<p>date to complete pre-construction services.</p> <p>The proposal schedule in Section 2.4 (page 14) states that Pre-Construction Services are 18 months from January 2023 to June 2024.</p> <p>Please confirm pre-construction services are from January 2023 to June 2024.</p>	
21	<p>Section 2.2 of the RFP (page 11) identifies Task No. 9 Construction Cost Estimate as a Pre-Construction Services Task.</p> <p>Exhibit A.15 Pre-Construction Services Pricing Information form does not have Task No. 9 identified.</p> <p>Are the hours for the development of the 65% Construction Cost Estimate to be included in Exhibit A.15?</p>	<p>A revised Exhibit A.15 is attached (Attachment 2) as part of this Addendum 2. This revised form should completely replace the original form in the RFP package. This revised Exhibit A.15 answers this question.</p>
22	<p>Section 2.2 of the RFP (page 10) states that the PM and specific Contractor team members, as needed, will attend public meetings as requested by MST.</p> <p>What is the frequency of these meetings during pre-construction?</p> <p>Please confirm MST would like our Community Affairs Representative at these public meetings?</p>	<p>MST expects to engage with community groups, agencies, or cities during pre-construction services. We anticipate 3-4 in-person meetings. We expect the contractor to attend up to 6 additional virtual meetings with groups that may include Caltrans, California Coastal Commission, Cities, bicycle advocacy groups, and/or other interested stakeholders. Contractor staff most familiar with the project along with a community affairs representative should attend these public meetings.</p>

Attachments:

1. Notes from September 9, 2022 Mandatory Pre-proposal Meeting – includes list of attendees
2. Revised Exhibit A.15 (dated September 15, 2022)



Attachment 1

Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting Notes

Request for Proposals RFP # 23-02
Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) for
SURF! Busway and Bus Rapid Transit Project

September 9, 2022
1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

a. Lisa Rheinheimer, MST, began meeting at precisely 1:30 p.m. with opening remarks. Reminded everyone that the meeting is mandatory and asked all to introduce themselves. Those in attendance, alphabetized by company name, were:

- i. Blue Lake Civil
 1. John Haggerty
 2. Tim Monroe
- ii. Future Systems
 1. Kerry Berlin
- iii. Granite Construction
 1. Jim Hovde
 2. Bill McGowan
- iv. Graniterock-Meyers JV
 1. Rodney Jenny
 2. Rob Snyder
- v. Harris and Associates
 1. Matt Nethercutt
 2. Dana Van Horn
- vi. Kimley-Horn
 1. Jack Boda
 2. Peter Meyerhofer
- vii. McGuire and Hester
 1. Ed Aldine
 2. Will Doud
- viii. Miyamoto
 1. Josh Reynolds
- ix. Monterey-Salinas Transit

1. Steven Bruno
2. Sonjé Dayries
3. Lisa Rheinheimer
4. Deanna Smith
5. Norman Tuitavuki
- x. Myers and Sons Construction
 1. Clinton Myers
- xi. Operating Engineers
 1. Neils Ash
- xii. Stacey and Witbeck
 1. Dan Elshire
 2. Sylvia Yean
- xiii. Teichert Construction
 1. Janez Seliskar
 2. Jason Theriault
- xiv. Walsh Construction
 1. David Cramer
 2. Danielle Norton
 3. Philip Tedone

II. SURF! PROJECT OVERVIEW

- a. Peter Meyerhofer, Kimley Horn, went through a detailed explanation of the SURF! Project and what MST is looking for from prospective contractors.
- b. After Peter's presentation, Lisa gave an opportunity for attendees to ask any questions.
 - i. No questions were asked.

III. REQUIREMENTS

- a. Lisa reminded all attendees that the SURF! Project uses federal funds, thus requiring many federal provisions.
- b. Lisa explained what is expected for proposal submissions.
 - i. One hard copy.
 - ii. One electronic copy.
 - iii. A separate cost proposal.
- c. Deanna Smith, MST, explained MST's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) provisions.
 - i. MST has a 1.5% DBE aspirational goal.
 - ii. It is encouraged, but not required, that MST's prime contractors use DBE subcontractors.
 1. If DBE subcontractors are used, MST requires prompt payment monitoring and documentation to DBEs.
 - iii. Lisa gave an opportunity to ask questions regarding requirements.
 1. Janez Seliskar, Teichert Construction – Is the 1.5% DBE goal for the construction phase of the project only?
 - a. Deanna explained that it applies to the entire contract and that it is a dollar value of the contract. It is an

overall aspirational goal and is not broken down by different parts of the contract. She reminds Janez that MST does not require the use of DBEs. MST can encourage it but cannot require it.

IV. SUBMITTAL DEADLINES

- a. Lisa described the following timeline/deadlines regarding the submission of proposals.
 - i. Any questions and clarifications are due from proposers to MST by Friday, September 16, 5:00 p.m. (Pacific).
 - ii. MST will respond to questions and provide clarifications by Friday, September 30.
 - iii. Proposals are due to MST by Friday, October 14 at 5:00 p.m., Pacific Time.
 1. Lisa reminded all attendees that no proposals will be accepted after the deadline. Proposals even one minute late will be disqualified.

V. SITE VISIT – FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9 AT 3:00 p.m.

- a. Lisa reminded all attendees that there is a non-mandatory site visit after the pre-proposal meeting. She informed all that the site visit will take place from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Anyone who wishes to attend will meet at the 8th Street bridge in Marina.

VI. FINAL QUESTIONS

- a. Lisa provided the opportunity to ask final questions.
 - i. Bill McGowan, Granite Construction – What format is MST looking for in regards to the hard copy proposal in reference to single method of fastening? Is a binder acceptable?
 1. Lisa explained that a binder is great and will be accepted.
 - ii. Bill McGowan, Granite Construction – Are 11x17 pages acceptable? If so, should they be counted as two pages instead of one?
 1. Lisa explains that 11x17 pages are fine and that they should be counted as a single page to avoid confusion.
 - iii. Clinton Myers, Myers and Sons Construction – When will the additional addendums be released? What is meant by “key personnel”? Using Bill McGowan’s question (above) as an example, Lisa explained that some of the questions addressed in the addendum will affect how the proposal is written. Lisa addressed the question about the definition of key personnel as an example.
 1. Lisa explained that MST has laid out what we are looking for in the request for proposals. Key personnel, using the Request for Proposals as a guide, each contractor should layout and explain who they think their key personnel are in this project in making it a shared success. MST will not determine who those individuals may be as contractors are

expected to draw from their past experience and success on other projects.

2. Clinton confirmed that he understands and has an idea of where to go from there.
- b. Lisa addressed the attendees and asked if email is the best way to communicate and convey information to them.
 - i. Several people expressed that email is fine.
- c. Lisa provided a last chance for questions.
 - i. No further questions were asked.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

- a. Lisa thanked all for attending and provided a reminder that there will be a non-mandatory site visit.
- b. Final call for questions.
 - i. No questions asked.
- c. Meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Site Visit

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Beginning at 8th Street

Representatives from the following companies attended the site visit:

- a. Granite Construction
- b. Graniterock-Meyers JV
- c. Harris and Associates
- d. McGuire and Hester
- e. Stacey and Witbeck
- f. Teichert Construction
- g. Walsh Construction

Attachment 2

REVISED 9/16/2022

Exhibit A.15

Pre-Construction Services Pricing Form

The Pricing Forms shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope, per Section 4 of this PFP.

Pre-Construction Service Pricing Form					
TASK NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	ANTICIPATED QUANTITY	x UNIT PRICE	= TOTAL PRICE
1	Pre-Construction Project Management* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager 	HR		\$	\$
2	On-Going Final Design Input* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superintendent • Office Engineer • Estimator • Scheduler • Quality Manager • Safety Manager • _____ • _____ 	HR		\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$
3	Sub-contracting Plan	LS	1	\$	\$
4	Conduct of Construction	LS	1	\$	\$
5	Design Submittal Review	LS	1	\$	\$
6	Early Bid Plan and Material	LS	1	\$	\$
7	Schedule	LS	1	\$	\$
8	Community Affairs	LS	1	\$	\$
9	Construction Cost Estimates	LS	1	\$	\$
				TOTAL PRICE =	\$ _____

* The Proposer may change, add or delete positions as needed to accurately reflect its staffing for Pre-Construction Services.

Date: _____ Signature: _____ Name (Print): _____
 Title: _____