



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Dave Cortese, Chair
Santa Clara County

Alicia C. Aguirre
Cities of San Mateo County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Jason Baker
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Mark Luce
Napa County and Cities

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Julie Pierce
Association of Bay Area Governments

Bijan Sartipi
California State
Transportation Agency

Libby Schaaf
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Amy Rein Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Alix Bockelman
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

April 22, 2016

**Addendum No. 1
to Request For Proposal for Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Update of
Plan Bay Area 2040 the Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities
Strategy
dated April 4, 2016**

Dear Bidder:

This letter is Addendum No. 1 to the above-titled procurement. Where text is revised, deleted text is shown in strike-through format; added text is italicized. The RFP is revised as follows:

| <u>Addendum Item</u> | <u>Reference</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|----------------------|--|---|
| 1 | RFP, Page 8, Form of Proposal, Section F. Qualifications and References, subsection 3. | 3. Provide a succinct description (one page maximum <i>per project</i>) of any previous projects similar to the services requested, indicating the project title, duration, budget, sponsoring agency and sponsor project manager, and roles played by individuals proposed for this study. Include the name of the agency for whom the work was performed, year performed, name of the contact person and their telephone number <i>and email address</i> . |

[The rest of this page left intentionally blank]

| <u>Addendum Item</u> | <u>Reference</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|----------------------|--|---|
| 2. | RFP, Page 17, Appendix A, Scope of Work, Task 6. | <p>CONSULTANT will revise and update all EIR chapters, using work products from all tasks identified above as appropriate.</p> <p><i>Chapter 2.7 (Geology) addresses Geology and should be reviewed for accuracy and completeness by the Consultant. Changes in this chapter would only be needed if the information previously provided was incomplete or inaccurate, could be significantly clarified if presented in a different manner, or if there is new relevant information to be presented. Overlay-style GIS mapping may need to be refreshed/updated to capture project changes (e.g. new or different land use and/or transportation).</i></p> <p><i>Chapter 2-8 (Water Resources) addresses hydrology. It too should be reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Changes in the chapter are appropriate under the same circumstances noted above for geology.</i></p> <p><i>Chapter 2.5 (Climate Change and GHG) addresses sea level change. It contains a separate CEQA significance threshold and pages 2.5-61 through 2.5-84 provide analysis and impact assessment. This entire analysis should be updated to be more rigorous, using the most recent available information and analysis methods.</i></p> |
| 3. | RFP, Appendix D, MTC Standard Consultant Contract, Attachment E, Insurance and Financial Security (Bond) Requirements, Section 1.A.2 | <p>2. <u>Commercial General Liability Insurance for Bodily Injury and Property Damage liability</u>, covering the premises and operations, and products and completed operations of CONSULTANT and CONSULTANT’s officers, agents, and employees and with limits of liability which shall not be less than \$2,000,000-\$1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence with a general aggregate liability of not less than \$4,000,000 \$2,000,000, a products/completed operations aggregate liability limit of not less than \$4,000,000 \$2,000,000, and Personal & Advertising Injury liability with a limit of not less than \$2,000,000 \$1,000,000. Such policy shall contain a Waiver of Subrogation in favor of MTC.</p> |

The remaining provisions of the RFP remain unchanged. In the event of a conflict between this Addendum and the previous version(s), this Addendum takes precedence.

Questions and Answers regarding this RFP are enclosed with this Addendum. Any questions concerning this Addendum should be directed to Adam Noelting at anoelting@mtc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,
 DocuSigned by:
Steve Heminger
021DA2741043405
Steve Heminger
 Executive Director

AB: an

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE UPDATE OF PLAN BAY AREA 2040
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN/ SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY
DATED APRIL 4, 2016**

**QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM PROPOSERS' CONFERENCE
HELD ON APRIL 15, 2016 AND OTHER QUESTIONS SUBMITTED**

Q1: What are PDA's?

A1: Generally, Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally identified infill development areas near transit. More specifically, PDAs are areas that communities identified as possible areas to grow, nominated by the city or town council via resolution. They are generally areas of at least 100 acres where there is local commitment to developing more housing along with amenities and services to meet the day-to-day needs of residents in a pedestrian-friendly environment served by transit. To be eligible to become a PDA, an area had to be within an existing community, near existing or planned fixed transit or served by comparable bus service, and planned for more housing. <http://abag.ca.gov/priority/>

Q2: How do you see the Priority Development Areas (PDA) numbers changing in these alternatives?

A2: PDAs will remain as a framework for each of the CEQA Alternatives. What may differ is the level and or density of growth within the PDAs.

Q3: Do you see the Transbay Tube being different in the three alternatives?

A3: Due to constraints on available revenues, it is unlikely that the Transbay Tube will be included in the Plan or any of the CEQA alternatives.

Q4: Are these five alternatives different from what is currently drafted?

A5: MTC and ABAG have not identified the project yet. The project will be adopted in September. The project (preferred alternative) is anticipated to be a blend of the initial alternatives (numbers 2, 3, 4) Staff wants to recommend an alternative, but will be researching all alternatives through to CEQA.

Q6: How will the differences between the current plan and the 2040 plan be communicated to us as consultants?

A6: MTC will explore a variety of tools to effectively communicate to selected consultant, such as providing a redline document, series of tables, matrices, and performance criteria. MTC will be working closely and collaboratively to provide information.

Q7: Have you given thought to the recent San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) case that discussed the need to look beyond the plan?

A7: Yes, 2050 GHG modeling should be addressed.

Q8: Will the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) do the air quality analysis?

A8: No. MTC is doing the greenhouse gas (GHG) and air quality analysis internally for the transportation sector.

Q9: How would priority conservation areas (PCA) relate to this plan?

A9: Generally, Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) are open spaces in need of protection that support the vitality of the region's natural systems, rural economy and human health. Similar to PDAs, the PCA framework is incorporated into each of the CEQA Alternatives.

Q10: Geology, hydrology, sea level rise were technical parts that were inputted in the original plan. Do you anticipate that technical input will be required in those areas, or will this update require a staff that is generally aware of these issues, but not necessarily experts?

A10: Please see Addendum Item No. 2.

Q11: Will you be looking at those thresholds in light of recent Supreme Court rulings?

A11: MTC will confer with legal counsel in collaboration with the selected consultant to adequately apply relevant case rulings, and modify the project as appropriate.

Q12: Is the contingency that the consultant is asked to include into their cost proposal supposed to fit within the \$450,000 budget, or can it exceed the budget?

A12: The contingency should be within the \$450,000 budget.

Q13: Can invoices be submitted monthly, or is it only when the milestone is accepted?

A13: When the milestone is accepted.

Q14: With the original Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the scoping meetings were extensive. To what extent do you see the consultant being involved in the scoping meetings for this update?

A15: MTC will be taking the lead in setting up and managing the meetings for this update. The consultant is expected to attend the meeting, and answer questions. Please see RFP, Page 16, Task 3: Participate in the EIR Scoping Process.

Q15: How many scoping meetings will there be?

A15: Please see RFP, Page 16, Task 3: Participate in the EIR Scoping Process.

Q16: In looking back at the prior EIR, is the level of effort of the last EIR reflective of what this EIR should be expected?

A16: Yes.

Q17: Is there anything we need to know about possibly preparing a stand-alone EIR instead of a supplement to the prior EIR?

A17: MTC believes a standalone EIR is most prudent.

Q18: Can you reconcile the conflict in the insurance requirements stated in RFP, Attachment D-1 and the MTC Standard Consultant Contract, Attachment E?

A18: Please see Addendum Item No. 3.

Q19: Page 8 refers to one page per project. Does that mean one page per project, or one page total for all of the projects?

A19: Please see Addendum Item No. 1.

Q20: Are there DBE requirements?

A20: No.

Q21: Can you explain to how many “X number” of deliverables refers?

A21: Assume that the consultant will be producing five paper copies of each deliverable.

Q22: Will MTC staff write sections for the DEIR?

A22: No. The consultant should expect data and modeling, but not drop in text.

Q23: Is there an expectation that there be an administrative record in the scope?

A23: Yes. Please see RFP, Page 19, Task 11. All documents should be easily publically available, and ideally provided as part of the record.

Q24: Under CEQA, alternatives are developed based on their ability to minimize impacts. Project alternatives do not always fulfill the requirements of CEQA alternatives. Is evaluating environmental impact going to be a focus of the alternatives?

A24: We have considered CEQA when developing alternatives. However, due to the nature of Senate Bill 375, that is inherent in the project alternatives.

Q25: Is the land use going to be fixed?

A25: It will be fixed according to each alternative’s description.

Q26: Please clarify if MTC staff will provide actual write up, or just the data for the transportation and air quality/GHG sections.

A26: See response to Question 22.

Q27: How many staff meetings should be planned for/budgeted?

A27: Please see RFP, Appendix A: Scope of Work. Each consultant should consider what they believe best fulfills the requirements of CEQA and the scope of work, keeping in mind the schedule, budget and meeting requirements already set forth in the Scope of Work.

Q28: Please confirm that separate legal, CEQA expertise is not required on the consulting team.

A28: Confirmed. While the consultant is not required to have its own separate legal counsel, the consultant must have knowledge of relevant legal issues so that those issues may be addressed in preparing the EIR. Please see RFP, Page 15, Phase One, Task 1, Paragraph 3.