



Adrienne J. Tissier, Chair
San Mateo County

Amy Rein Worth, Vice Chair
Cities of Contra Costa County

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

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Dave Cortese
Santa Clara County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Mark Green
Association of Bay Area Governments

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Licardo
Cities of Santa Clara County

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Kevin Mullin
Cities of San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

August 21, 2012
Addendum No. 1

to

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
Regional Express Lane Network Electronic Toll Services
System Manager,
dated August 1, 2012

Dear Consultant:

This letter is Addendum No. 1 to the Request for Qualifications ("RFQ") for Regional Express Lane Network Electronic Toll Services System Manager dated August 1, 2012. Where text is revised, deleted text is shown in strike-through format; added text is *italicized*. The RFQ is revised as follows:

<u>Addendum Item</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Change</u>
1	RFQ, Letter of Invitation, <u>Statement of Qualifications Due Date</u> , page 1	Interested firms must submit an original, eight (8) hard copies of their Statement of Qualifications (SOQs) no later than 4 p.m., Thursday, August 30 , <i>September 6</i> 2012, as specified below.
2.	RFQ, Letter of Invitation, <u>Selection Timetable</u> , page 4	4 p.m. (PST), Thursday, August 30 , <i>September 6</i> 2012 Closing date and time for receipt of Statements of Qualifications at MTC offices
3.	RFQ, Letter of Invitation, <u>Selection Timetable</u> , page 4	September <i>21 or 24</i> , 18-24 , 2012 (approx.), Interviews (if needed)
4.	RFQ, I. PURPOSE & PROJECT DESCRIPTION, <u>Background</u> , page 4	Add the following to the list of supporting documentation: <i>7. Request for Proposal (RFP) 10-1: SR 237/I-880 Express Lanes Connector Project. February 12, 2010.</i>

5.	<p>RFQ, II. MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROPOSER QUALIFICATIONS</p> <p>A. <u>Minimum Qualifications</u>, page 6</p>	<p>The Minimum Qualifications are revised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Task leads proposed for the project must have at least five (5) years of experience in management of toll system procurement and <i>implementation of toll systems for roadways or bridges for express lanes involving the tasks similar to those outlined in Appendix A, <u>Preliminary Scope of Work</u>.</i> 2. Designated Project Manager in charge must have at least ten (10) years relevant <i>experience in management of toll system procurement and implementation of toll systems for roadways or bridges involving the tasks similar to those outlined in Appendix A, Preliminary Scope of Work. At least two (2) of the 10 years must be for express lanes.</i> <p>The Other Qualifications are revised, in part, as follows:</p> <p>B. Other <i>Relevant</i> Qualifications</p> <p>In addition to the qualifications reflected by the MQs listed above, MTC seeks a firm with the following qualifications, which will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section V. <i>Experience with express lane toll systems is particularly relevant and will be given preference in the evaluation over experience with other toll systems.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Project management experience</u> <u>[bullets # 1 and 6; no change in bullets 2-5 and 7]:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Development of system requirements and requests for proposal or other procurement documents for express lane toll system integrators; ❑ Oversight for installation and operation of electronic toll collection equipment on express lanes; and 2. <u>IT architecture, software</u>
----	--	---

		<p><u>design/development and implementation oversight experience:</u> [bullets 1 and 2; no change in bullet 3]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Design, development, testing, and implementation of electronic toll collection systems, including the internal controls and financial systems for express lanes; ❑ IT solutions, including current software best practices and standards, <i>knowledge of configuration management</i>, and systems architecture. <p>3. Express lane Toll <u>system design and procurement experience:</u> [bullet 2; no change in bullets 1 or 3-5]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Violation enforcement rules and technologies <i>for express lanes</i>;
<p>6.</p>	<p>RFQ, Letter of Invitation, <u>Organizational Conflict of Interest</u> page 3, and RFQ IV. FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, <u>J. Conflict of Interest</u>, page 9</p>	<p>The Conflicts of Interest provision is revised, in part, as follows:</p> <p>Describe in detail any current and/or future potential organizational conflicts of interest as they relate to the tasks listed in <i>Appendix A, Preliminary Scope of Work</i>, and, <i>if such conflicts of interest do not involve the prohibited interests described in paragraph 2 below</i>, propose mitigations for the potential conflicts. Please include in this discussion any potential conflicts arising from contracts with other Bay Area express lane operators identified in Section IV.H above.</p> <p>The following contractors are not eligible to submit SOQs <i>as prime consultants</i>: (1) any firm that develops or sells software for tolling systems; <i>such firms also may not participate as a subconsultant in an SOQ</i>; or (2) any firm that operates the Bay Area FasTrak® Customer Service Center <i>as the prime contractor or sub-contractor</i>.</p>

7.	RFQ IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, G. <u>Work Sample</u>, page 8	The first sentence of paragraph one is amended as follows: A copy of one report or final work product prepared by key members of the consultant team <i>and submitted as a final work product to a client (including MTC or BATA)</i> in which scope and details are comparable to this project.

The remaining provisions of the RFQ, dated August 1, 2012, 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 RFQ are enclosed with this Addendum. MTC will issue a second set of Questions and Answers, and any addenda if necessary, responding to requests for exceptions or changes to MTC's standard contract terms, including insurance requirements.

Any questions concerning this addendum to the RFQ should be directed to Lisa Klein, Project Manager, at (510) 817-5832 or lklein@mtc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,


Steve Heminger
Executive Director

SH:LK

J:\CONTRACT\Procurements\Operations & Support Svcs\RFQs\Express Lane Network\2012 ELN Systems Mgmt Services RFQ Addendum No. 1 final.doc

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)
REGIONAL EXPRESS LANE NETWORK ELECTRONIC TOLL SERVICES
SYSTEM MANAGER
dated August 1, 2012**

Proposers' Conference and Submitted Questions and Answers

August 21, 2012

Q1: Will a document cover that included the information request in RFQ, IV. FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection B, Title Page, satisfy the requirement of Subsection B?

A1: Yes, as long as it includes all of the required elements, including a signature of the partner or official of the firm authorized to solicit business and enter into contracts for the firm.

Q2: Are there any page-limit requirements for the Statement of Qualifications?

A2: RFQ, Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsections E, Similar Projects, and G, Work Sample, include page limits. No other page limits apply.

Q3: Can MTC provide a draft copy of the Concept of Operations for the Express Lanes?

A3: No. A draft is not available. See RFP, Section I, PURPOSE & PROJECT DESCRIPTION, page 3.

Q4: In response to Subsection E, Similar Projects, under Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, may a project be listed to satisfy this requirement wherein the consultant's role and responsibility has been completed, but the project itself has not yet opened?

A4: Yes.

Q5: In response to Subsection G, Work Sample, under Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, should the sample be in the same format as it was submitted by the consultant to the client?

A5: Not necessarily, as long as the content is identical to the final work product submitted to the client.

Q6: In response to Subsection I, Price Proposal, under Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, is there a specific format in which the price proposal should be submitted?

A6: While no specific format is required, please include information regarding positions, with corresponding descriptions and hourly rates, and types and amounts of anticipated expenses. Rates should be fully loaded hourly rates. Note that Addendum No 1 requires that the Price Proposal be submitted separate in a sealed envelope.

Q7: Regarding Subsection K, Forms and Certificates, under Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, are subcontractors required to submit these?

A7: While prime contractors are responsible for passing through federal requirements to subcontractors, only prime contractors must submit any forms in the RFQ to MTC.

Q8: Regarding Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection J, Conflicts of Interest, does MTC consider it a conflict of interest if a subconsultant member of the proposal team is currently providing strategic advisory services to a Bay Area public agency that owns/operates express lanes?

A8: This is not a prohibited interest by definition, but please consult and follow the guidelines provided in the RFP at Subsection J, Conflicts of Interest, under Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, page 9. Also, see Addendum No. 1.

Q9: May a firm that proposes on the Bay Area FasTrak® Customer Service Center participate as a sub-consultant on this project?

A9: Please see Addendum No. 1 regarding revised Subsection J, Conflicts of Interest. Any firm that operates the Bay Area FasTrak® Customer Service Center as a prime contractor or subcontractor is not eligible to submit an SOQ as the prime contractor. A firm that participates in operating the Bay Area FasTrak® Customer Service Center as a subcontractor may be eligible to participate as a sub-consultant in an SOQ for this project; however, MTC reserves the right to evaluate and determine that a firm is ineligible based on a conflict of interest. Please consult and follow the guidelines referenced in A8.

Q10: Regarding Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection J, Conflicts of Interest, page 9, second paragraph, will MTC replace item (1) as follows:

(1) any firm that is providing toll collection systems to MTC, Alameda County Transportation Commission, Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority or the Valley Transportation Authority;

and add the following statement:

“Any firm and any of its subconsultants that are selected under this contract are explicitly prohibited from bidding on and providing any services that are specified by requests for proposals developed under this contracts.”

A10: No. This language does not address all of MTC’s concerns. See Addendum No. 1 regarding revised Subsection J, Conflicts of Interest.

Q11: Can you clarify the definition of “express lanes” as used in the Minimum Qualifications, and as applied to task leaders?

A11: Please see revisions to Minimum Qualification in Addendum No. 1

Q12: Would successful award of this MTC contract preclude the selected firm from pursuing future Express Lanes work with Caltrans, MTC, or any county congestion management agency (CMA) if these agencies are responsible for detailed design, advertisement, award and/or construction oversight for the civil components of this project?

A12: MTC cannot anticipate all potential future organizational conflicts of interest and would not be the determining agency regarding conflicts with respect to contracts with Caltrans, CMAs, or other Bay Area express lane operators. The firm awarded the work under this RFQ would be precluded from bidding for the MTC express lane system integrator contract and the BATA FasTrak[®] Customer Service Center contract. See RFQ Sections IV, STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection J, Conflicts of Interest and VI, GENERAL CONDITIONS, Subsection G, Organizational Conflicts of Interest.

Q13: Does MTC require that the references provided under RFQ Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection D, References and Subsection E, Similar Projects, page 8 be the same?

A13: No.

Q14: Regarding Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection D, References, and Subsection E, Similar Projects, page 8, may these two Subsections be combined?

A14: Please provide all the information asked for in Subsection E, i.e., summaries of at least three projects, with the attendant requested relevant information for each project, including client contact information. See A15 below regarding a cross-reference to Subsection E in response to Subsection D.

Q15: Will the contacts provided for Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection E satisfy the request for references in Subsection D?

A15: The client contact information provided in response to Subsection E may be cross-referenced to satisfy the request for references in Subsection D, if stated explicitly.

Q16: Regarding Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection G, Work Sample, page 8, can the entire Work Sample section be marked as proprietary as long as we follow the format and instructions as described in Section F of the General Conditions section of the RFQ?

A16: Yes, if the entire sample meets the requirement of RFQ, VI. GENERAL CONDITIONS, Subsection F, Public Records. However, non-proprietary information is preferable so as to allow for an open and public evaluation process of consultants.

Q17: Regarding Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection H, MTC and Bay Area Express Lane Contracts, if a firm is providing travel information services to MTC, does this project information need to be provided under this requirements of this subsection?

A17: Yes.

Q18: Regarding Section IV, FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection H, MTC and Bay Area Express Lane Contracts, does work provided for MTC, Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA), or MTC Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) that is not related to tolling projects need to be listed and described in the SOQ?

A18: Yes, all projects with MTC, BATA and MTC SAFE should be listed and described.

Q19: Is international experience in tolling systems considered relevant and valuable in response to this RFQ?

A19: Yes; however, proposer will need to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of United States federal and California state laws governing tolling and their impact on designing and operating express lanes in the Bay Area.

Q20: Will experience with similar toll roads (but not express lanes) be considered?

A20: Yes. See Addendum No. 1.

Q21: Under the Minimum Qualifications for the Project Manager, what qualifies as relevant experience?

A21: See Addendum No. 1.

Q22: Is a firm eligible to submit a proposal if it maintains software under maintenance contracts with tolling agencies, which sometimes requires developing drivers and other processes, but does not compete for software or hardware contracts and does not sell software?

A22: Yes.

Q23: Are the firms identified as current contractors on page 5 of the RFQ eligible to submit an SOQ? For example, is the current program manager eligible?

A23: It is up to the submitting firms to determine whether they are eligible to submit an SOQ.

Q24: Is proposing experience from transit system engineering of equal value to express lane/toll system engineering?

A24: Transit system engineering will not substitute for toll system experience in terms of minimum qualifications; however, it may be relevant under "Other Relevant Qualifications" that do not refer specifically to experience with express lanes or toll systems.

Q25: Must interested parties submitting Statements of Qualifications include any of the forms required under RFQ, VI. GENERAL CONDITIONS, Subsection H. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Policy, at the time of submission?

A25: The requirements of Subsection H apply only at the time federal funds may be added to the awarded contract. Proposers do not need to submit any DBE forms with the Statement of Qualifications. If federal funds are added in the future, the awarded consultant will be required to complete the required forms when task orders are issued.

Q26: Does this project have a goal for Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) or Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (UDBE)?

A26: The Express Lanes Network System Manager Project does not currently include any federal money, so there is no Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE) goal at this time. However, if federal money is added in the future to any contract resulting from this RFQ, task order goals will be added. Note that the California Department of Transportation

(Caltrans) requires recipients of DOT grant funds through Caltrans to impose the DBE utilization requirements on its consultants and contractors, not only UDBEs. See RFQ, VI. GENERAL CONDITIONS, Subsection H, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Policy.

Q27: What is a typical DBE goal for this type of work?

A27: DBE goals vary depending on the location of the work, the specific type of work and the number of DBE firms willing to perform the work. DBE goals for MTC contracts typically range from 5% to 30% or more.

Q28: Does each task order executed under the contract have to meet the DBE requirements, or the contract overall?

A28: If federal money is added in the future to any contract resulting from this RFQ, DBE goals will be set as task orders are issued, and the selected contractor will be required to meet the federal requirements for each task order.

Q29: Must the forms at APPENDIX D-1, CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTION and APPENDIX D-2, CERTIFICATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING, be submitted with Statements of Qualifications?

A29: Yes. See RFQ at IV. FORM OF STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS, Subsection K, Forms and Certificates Proposers are required to submit completed federal-required certifications related to lobbying and debarment (*Appendices D-1, D-2*).

Q30: Why must Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs) be certified in California?

A30: DBE firms must be certified in California because federal funds flow through the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which requires a California certification. Bidders can get help identifying DBE certified firms at Caltrans' website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/dbe_program.htm . MTC encourages bidders to read the RFQ to understand the meaning of 'good faith effort' in the context of meeting DBE requirements.

Q31: Will MTC extend the possible interview date beyond September 24, 2012?

A31: MTC is not able to extend the interview schedule. See Addendum No. 1