

# ADDENDUM # 4



Hampton Roads Regional Connectors' Study

TPO-RFP-2018-01

**January 29, 2018**

The **Questions** received before, during, and after the Pre-Proposal Conference follow, along with the *Answers*.

## ATTENDEES TO PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING – JANUARY 19, 2018

Co/Org/Locality	Individual	email	phone
AECOM	Bill Cashman	<a href="mailto:bill.cashman@aecom.com">bill.cashman@aecom.com</a>	757 321-1220
AECOM	Susan Anderson	<a href="mailto:susan.anderson@aecom.com">susan.anderson@aecom.com</a>	804 515-8559
AECOM	Unwanna Dabney	<a href="mailto:unwanna.dabney@aecom.com">unwanna.dabney@aecom.com</a>	757 313-1805
Bonney & Company	Chris Bonney	<a href="mailto:chris@bonneyresearch.com">chris@bonneyresearch.com</a>	757 481-7030
C&M Associates	Carlos Contreras	<a href="mailto:cmcontreras@candm-associates.com">cmcontreras@candm-associates.com</a>	972 522-9373
CDM Smith	Manuch Amir	<a href="mailto:amirm@cdmsmith.com">amirm@cdmsmith.com</a>	804 377-2293
City of Hampton	Lynn E. Allsbrook	<a href="mailto:lallsbrook@hampton.gov">lallsbrook@hampton.gov</a>	757 726-2930
City of Norfolk	Brian Fowler	<a href="mailto:brian.fowler@norfolk.gov">brian.fowler@norfolk.gov</a>	757 664-7303
City of Portsmouth	Susan Wilson	<a href="mailto:Wilson@portsmouthva.gov">Wilson@portsmouthva.gov</a>	757 393-8836
Fin Advisory Investment Management Group LLC	Katrina Riddick	<a href="mailto:katrina_riddick@msn.com">katrina_riddick@msn.com</a>	443 286-5273
Froehling & Robertson	Dawn Best	<a href="mailto:dbest@fandr.com">dbest@fandr.com</a>	757 213-9702
HRPDC	Nancy K. Collins	<a href="mailto:ncollins@hrpdcva.gov">ncollins@hrpdcva.gov</a>	757 420-8300
HRPDC/HRTPO	Bob Crum	<a href="mailto:bcrum@hrpdcva.gov">bcrum@hrpdcva.gov</a>	757 420-8300
HRTAC	Kevin Page	<a href="mailto:kpage@hrtac.org">kpage@hrtac.org</a>	757 413-9315
HRTPO	Camelia Ravanbakht	<a href="mailto:cravanbakht@hrtpo.org">cravanbakht@hrtpo.org</a>	757 420-8300
HRTPO	Dale Stith	<a href="mailto:dstith@hrtpo.org">dstith@hrtpo.org</a>	757 420-8300
HRTPO	Keith Nichols	<a href="mailto:knichols@hrtpo.org">knichols@hrtpo.org</a>	757 420-8300
HRTPO	Kendall Miller	<a href="mailto:kmiller@hrtpo.org">kmiller@hrtpo.org</a>	757 420-8300
HRTPO	Rob Case	<a href="mailto:rcase@hrtpo.org">rcase@hrtpo.org</a>	757 420-8300
ICF	Michael Grant	<a href="mailto:michael.grant@icf.com">michael.grant@icf.com</a>	703 218-2692
JMT	Chris Swartz	<a href="mailto:cswartz@jmt.com">cswartz@jmt.com</a>	757 552-1096
Kimley-Horn & Associates	Carroll E. Collins	<a href="mailto:carroll.collins@kimley-horn.com">carroll.collins@kimley-horn.com</a>	757 213-8616
McPherson Consulting Michael Baker International	Karen McPherson	<a href="mailto:kmcpherson@mcphersonconsulting.com">kmcpherson@mcphersonconsulting.com</a>	757 580-5279
	Craig Eddy	<a href="mailto:craig.eddy@mbakerintl.com">craig.eddy@mbakerintl.com</a>	804 287-3160
Moffatt & Nichol	Samuel Hayes	<a href="mailto:shayes@moffattnichol.com">shayes@moffattnichol.com</a>	804 320-1996
PRR	Jessica Bedenbaugh	<a href="mailto:jbedenbaugh@pr.com">jbedenbaugh@pr.com</a>	757 472-1933
RK&K	Chuck Cayton	<a href="mailto:ccayton@rkk.com">ccayton@rkk.com</a>	757 348-8389
RK&K	Dwight Farmer	<a href="mailto:dfarmer@rkk.com">dfarmer@rkk.com</a>	757 647-3420
RK&K	Jim Long	<a href="mailto:jlong@rkk.com">jlong@rkk.com</a>	757 639-1391
RK&K	Stacy Dorroh	<a href="mailto:sdorroh@rkk.com">sdorroh@rkk.com</a>	757 498-4123
Sabra, Wang and Assoc	Bill Monroe	<a href="mailto:bmonroe@sabra-wang.com">bmonroe@sabra-wang.com</a>	443 741-3500
Spann & Associates, LLC	Bruce A. Spann	<a href="mailto:bspenn@spannllc.com">bspenn@spannllc.com</a>	757 985-9580
The Port of Virginia	Kit Chope	<a href="mailto:kchope@portofvirginia.com">kchope@portofvirginia.com</a>	757 683-2152
US Army Corps of Engrs	George Janek	<a href="mailto:george.a.janek@usace.army.mil">george.a.janek@usace.army.mil</a>	757 201-7135
US Army Corps of Engrs	Jason Flowers	<a href="mailto:jason.r.flowers@usace.army.mil">jason.r.flowers@usace.army.mil</a>	757 201-7017
USCG	Colleen Symansky, LCDR	<a href="mailto:colleen.a.symansky@uscg.mil">colleen.a.symansky@uscg.mil</a>	757 483-8504
VDOT	Scott Smizik	<a href="mailto:scott.smizik@vdot.virginia.gov">scott.smizik@vdot.virginia.gov</a>	804 786-7401
WSP	Tim Rayner	<a href="mailto:tim.rayner@wsp.com">tim.rayner@wsp.com</a>	757 466-9631

## QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

**Q1: On page 62 of the RFP under Phase IV, Section A – Develop study approach, the first bullet says to “develop appropriate relationship to NEPA.” Can you elaborate on what is meant by this? Do you mean what type of document should be prepared, or what level of evaluation is required, or something else?**

*A1: In order to determine ‘permit-ability’ in Phase III (at least), the work should clearly identify environmental considerations, nature of any wetland impacts, potential mitigations, and any possible impacts to property.*

*Under Phase IV (“develop appropriate relationship to NEPA”), given that this study will NOT provide a “NEPA document” but any construction project coming out of this study WILL require a NEPA document, it would be appropriate for the chosen consultant to recommend the “study approach” for this study that would best relate to a possible NEPA study to follow (e.g., are there things to AVOID in this study [work that would violate the NEPA process]? Are there things appropriate to NOT include in this study, leaving them instead for the NEPA study? Are there ways of doing environmental work in this study to make a following NEPA study easier or less expensive?).*

**Q2: On page 63 under Phase V, the scope states that the consultant is to determine if implementing feasible projects would negatively impact the transportation system during interim periods. Can you be more specific as to which interim years need to be evaluated or is this a subjective evaluation?**

*A2: The order of implementation needs to be prioritized so that a phase of a project does not negatively impact the transportation network including local streets. Interim improvements may be warranted in order to minimize negative impacts.*

**Q3: Also on page 63 under Communication and Outreach, the scope states that the consultant will develop simulations. What type of simulations are expected, micro-simulations of traffic operating conditions or some other type of simulation?**

*A3: It would be beneficial to have micro-simulations of traffic operations and conditions. Simulations of the entire project including different alternative scenarios are very useful visual tools for the public involvement process. Given the topography of the region and study area, these simulations would assist the public and stakeholders to better understand and visualize how the proposed improvements could alleviate congestion and provide traffic improvements to the transportation system.*

**Q4: RFP Page 8, Section VI, E as well as Section VII state that the submittal should be one volume; however, instructions for the mandatory DBE Form 400 (RFP Page 46) clearly state that the form and supporting documentation should be submitted in a separate package. Please clarify your preference.**

*A4: When the RFP was written there was a separation of duties between DBE compliance and Procurement. As it stands now, the same person will be reviewing all aspects of the Proposal. Please submit all information, including DBE, as one document.*

**Q5: RFP Page 31, Appendix B lists the required forms. Are these forms required of the prime firm only or all firms included on the team (prime + sub)?**

*A5: These forms are required only of the prime. In the case of co-primes, they would be required of both. In the case of subs, only the prime needs to submit these forms.*

**Q6: RFP Page 29, SWaM Participation states that if portions of the services are to be subcontracted to a DBE/SWaM, the firm should submit with its proposal a commitment/confirmation letter. These letters are not included in Appendix B as required forms. Please confirm that these letters are to be included.**

*A6: These letters are not template forms. They are required from the prime, committing to use specific DBE/SWaM firm(s), what job functions the prime will be subcontracting to each of these firms, and the percentage of participation. The listed DBE/SWaM firm(s) need to supply a letter, confirming that they are qualified and available to perform the services listed in the prime's letter, along with the percentage of participation they are committed to perform.*

**Q7: Please identify the names and number of stakeholders mentioned in the RFP.**

*A7: The RFP includes a list of four groups of Stakeholders (page 61). The expectation is for the consultant to identify specific stakeholders in each of the four groups, in coordination with the Regional Connectors Study Working Group and Steering (Policy) Committee. Please note that this effort should focus more on having a comprehensive approach to solicit input and conduct outreach as opposed to determining a specific number.*

*However, to assist with this task, we recommend the following sources/contacts as a starting point:*

**General Public-** *Conduct Public Outreach/Survey(s) and contact the HRTPO Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)*

**Freight Industry** – *Contact the HRTPO Freight Transportation Advisory Committee (FTAC) and Virginia Port Authority*

**Military** – Contact military representatives of the Regional Connectors Study (RCS) Working Group and Steering (Policy) Committee; and military representatives on the HRTPO Board.

**Hospitality and Tourism** – Contact the Hampton Roads Chamber of Commerce and the Virginia Peninsula Chamber of Commerce

**Q8: What is the SWaM Goal (as opposed to the DBE Goal of 10%)?**

A8: Both the DBE and SWaM goals are 12% each.

**Q9: While it was mandatory for all Primes to attend this Pre-Bid meeting, was it mandatory for sub consultants as well?**

A9: No

**Q10: Will the sign-in sheet from today's meeting be available online?**

A10: See beginning of this Addendum.

**Q11: Please provide more explanation of the Evaluation of Proposal factors in the RFP. Please expand on "accessibility of firm and key personnel." (Under Factors in RFP, page 11.)**

A11: Qualifications and Experience: 30%

- Firm's qualifications, requires professional staff to be degreed/certified relevant to the purpose of the RFP.
- Firm's experience requires engagement in prior projects of a similar nature.
- Each of these areas will qualify for half of this factor's point value.

Capabilities, skills, and Resources: 35%

- Appropriate staff, technology, resources, etc. to conduct the study and meet the project deliverables on time and on budget.

Experience Involving Multiple Local Jurisdictions/Agencies: 15%

- Proven ability to work with varying perspectives and priorities among varying levels of government.

Accessibility of Firm and Key Personnel: 10%

- The consultant contact needs to be responsive in a timely manner.

DBE/SWaM Participation: 10%

Please see page 11 of the RFP.

**Q12: Does participation in the Hampton Roads Major Projects Contract prohibit a consultant from submitting a proposal in response to this RFP?**

A12: No.

**Q13: Regarding Required DBE Forms for RFPs/RFQs (page 26) and the DBE Participation Form 400 (pages 47-5): The DBE Participation Form-400 includes a space for both the “Dollar Value of Subcontract” and “% of Utilization” to be listed for each DBE firm. The actual contract value is currently unknown. Are we required to list both the anticipated dollar value and percentage for DBE firms? Would the “% of utilization” be sufficient?**

A13: Please list the % of the prime’s workload the prime anticipates subcontracting to a DBE.

**Q14: Regarding Section VII, Specific Proposal Instructions: The RFP does not request offerors to provide a technical project approach. Nor does Section X, Selection Criteria, include a description of how a technical approach would be evaluated or scored. Are offerors expected to submit a technical approach? If so, under which factor will it be evaluated?**

A14: The technical approach will be evaluated under the Capabilities, Skills, and Resources Factor.

**Q15: Please confirm that no pricing information or task approach is being requested in the proposal response.**

A15: No pricing information is required. However, your approach to the study is required.

**Q16: Under Section VII. Specific Proposal Instructions (page 8), item B.4., the RFP indicates: "Provide a brief description of your organization structure." Is this intended to be a description of the prime consultant's organizational structure, or a description of the proposed team's organization (i.e., proposed roles of the prime and subcontractor consultants)?**

*A16: Prime's organizational structure only.*