KARGO Sustainability Study Phase I- RFP
Questions & Answers

Q1: For Task 3, are all these 20 alternatives expected to be related to network operation and circulation? Or they are a combination of land use, freight flows , economic factors, etc.?

A1: The alternatives are circulation option scenarios on an unchanging land use/socio-economic base at buildout which assume the 2042 RTP/SCS. Some refinement of the socio-economic base data may be necessary but it will not differ from what is in the General Plans. The travel model includes a freight mode that is generated by the number of warehousing employees and industrial employees at each TAZ. For this study those locations will be static, but some adjustment of the base may be necessary. Performance measures will rely primarily on output from the Kern COG Travel model or post model GIS analysis (total VMT, V/C ratio, residents within 500' of 50,000+ VMT roadways, etc.). Kern COG staff will make the model runs. The consultant will work with the stakeholders to develop the 20 alternatives and provide maps for COG staff to code the model with.

Q2: For Task 4, could you provide an example for the footprint drawing? Given the defined budget and scope of this RFP it is important to understand what level of detail you are expecting for these 20 drawings.

A2: The footprints should be conceptual and for planning purposes only, not exceeding 15% design drawings. In coordination with the agencies listed in the RFP, the consultant should determine an interchange footprint that would be functional for the facility and likely preserve enough right-of-way if incorporated into a future adopted planning line for the agency to further evaluate. If the funding level is deemed inadequate, the consultant shall recommend amendments to this task (such as reducing the number of footprints or limiting quality/detail/steps) for not exceeding the $100k budget.

Q3: On page 12 at Method of Payments, three methods are identified: Lump sum, Cost plus fixed fee, Specific rates. It is not clear what method is preferred for this proposal. Please clarify.

A3: Kern COG prefers monthly progress billings at specific rates.

Q4: On the cost at the bottom of Page 19 a reference to a sample form contract that is supposed to be attached as Exhibit D. Exhibit D could not be located. Could you provide the link to download it.

A4: The link to download the sample contract has been added to the RFP page:
https://www.kerncog.org/category/working-with-kern-cog/request-for-proposals/

Q5: Sealed Bids – The RFP leaves the decision on sealed bids up to the proposer. Is it engineering work or planning work?

A5: Kern COG is requesting planning level maps for conceptual purposes only. The funding level in the contract does not anticipate engineering or design level work. The sealed bid requirement is required should a consultant wish to provide a higher level of design or engineering services. If you plan on doing so, your bid amount must be sealed as specified. This provision was provided because of change state law.

KARGO Sustainability Study Phase I- RFP
Questions & Answers

Q6: On Task 4 paragraph 2, there is the statement that specific plan lines should be developed and there might be up to 20 of these to prepare. If they are to the level of defining the r/w limits sufficiently to be adopted by agencies for the preservation of r/w, we believe the effort required would exceed the current budget. Please clarify the level of detail desired and how that fits into the existing budget.

A6: The footprint maps should be conceptual and for planning purposes only, not exceeding 15% design drawings. We would like to be able to use them in the circulation plans as conceptual placeholders for future interchanges and r/w limits. In coordination with the PSC agencies listed in the RFP, the goal is consultant should determine an interchange footprint that would be functional for the facility and likely preserve enough right-of-way if incorporated into a future adopted planning line for the agency to further evaluate. If the funding level is deemed inadequate, the consultant shall recommend amendments to this task (such as reducing the number of footprints or limiting quality/detail/steps) for not exceeding the $100k budget. Unfunded activities may be picked up during Phase II.

Q7: Under the Payment method section there is the Lump Sum Payment method. Can we specify an overall lump sum cost and show a breakdown by milestone and then not worry about submitting a breakdown of hours and personnel? Alternatively, under Payment Method, can we just submit our current rate schedule and have it deemed "reasonable" and use it for the contract rather than going through the whole federal method of rates and multipliers and overhead expenses…?

A7: Kern COG prefers monthly progress billings at specific rates.

Q8: The RFP stated the Notice To Proceed is intended for October 25th. What is your expectation for the completion date of the project? Are there any deadlines that applicants needs to be aware of?.

A8: Our preferred project completion is by June 2020, however each consultant should submit a schedule that is reasonable for their firm and may provide additional information about why their project schedule differs from the projected timeline, if that is the case.