

Response to Questions for Request for Proposal #2025-06
Solano Rail Hub Project Pedestrian Crossing and Station Area Improvements Project
Preparation of Project Approval and Environmental Documentation (PA&ED), as well
as Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E)

1. Given that Requirements 3–11 outlines detailed content—including Project Understanding, Approach and Management Plan, Staffing Plan, Work Plan and Schedule, and Cost Control—we would like to confirm whether all of these items are expected to be included within the 10-page limit, or if any may be submitted outside of that count (e.g., in an appendix or as standalone sections).

Could you please confirm whether the 10-page limit applies to the entire proposal or just specific sections?

Response

The 10-page limit applies to the narrative of the proposal and proposers are encouraged to submit additional information supporting the narrative as an appendix. Appendices will not count toward the 10-page limit.

2. Is the Appendix referenced in Item 1 on Page 11 (“Include in the appendix similar examples of past projects”) considered separate from the “Additional Relevant Information” section described in Item 10 on Page 13, or are these intended to be combined into a single appendix?

Response

The appendix referenced in Item 1 of the RFP Submittal Requirements is intended to be different, but could be the same as Item 10. Please keep in mind, however, that Item 10 has a 2-page limit. Proposals will be evaluated based on the consultant selection criteria outlined in the RFP on page 14.

3. Is there a page limitation for the appendix referenced in Item 1 on Page 11, where similar examples of past projects are to be included?

Response

There is no page limitation for the appendix referenced in Item 1 on page 11 of the RFP.

4. Under the **RFP SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS** section beginning on Page 11, Item #6 (on Page 12) is titled “Work Plan and Schedule,” and Item #8 (on Page 13) is also titled “Work Plan and Schedule.” While the titles are similar, the content descriptions differ. Could STA please clarify how proposers should differentiate between these two sections and structure their responses accordingly?

Response

We have amended the original RFP to omit Item #8 of the RFP Submittal Requirements. The amended RFP is posted on our website at <https://www.sta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/RFP-2025-06-Addendum.Final-07.14.25-1.pdf>. Proposers should ignore the omitted item and structure their response based on item #6 (Work Plan and Schedule).

5. When will the attendee list for the pre-submittal meeting be posted? Will that be on the website?

Response

The pre-proposal meeting list of attendees will be posted on STA's website on Monday, July 14, 2025. This list is included in this document as Attachment A.

6. Budget Clarification: Page 13, Section 13 notes that STA may reject proposals that do not fall within the established budget. Could you please confirm the budget range?

Response

The STA, once the proposals received have been reviewed and scored, will negotiate with the selected consultant to determine the most appropriate budget to complete the tasks, Tasks 1 -5, associated with this RFP.

7. Amtrak Study Status: What is the current status of the Amtrak study? Has Amtrak selected a preferred alternative? We are seeking to understand where Amtrak's responsibilities end and where those of the STA consultant begin.

Response

Coordination and interaction with the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority and Amtrak as outlined on Item 7 of the original RFP Submittal Requirements on page 12 will be a major task of this RFP. However, Amtrak's station facility improvements are not part of this RFP. The STA consultant will be responsible for the tasks associated with completing the PA&ED of the pedestrian crossing improvements connecting the Cities of Fairfield and Suisun City.

8. Proposal Page Limit: Page 11, Section 1 states that qualifications (excluding resumes and the transmittal letter) are limited to 10 pages, with past projects to be included in the appendix. We understand that an additional two pages may be allowed for supplemental information.

Does the 10-page limit apply to the following sections?

- a. Project Understanding
- b. Approach and Management Plan
- c. Qualifications and Experience
- d. Work Plan and Schedule
- e. Staffing Plan
- f. Cost Control

Response

The 10-page limit applies to the narrative section of the proposal. Proposers can add supporting materials as appendices, which will not count toward the 10-page limit. Proposers can reorganize the order of the Submittal Requirements to create a more cohesive and concise narrative, provided all requested contents are included.

9. Are the references excluded from the 10-page limit and be part of the past projects?

Response

Yes, references are excluded from the 10-page limit and could be part of the past projects.

10. Work Plan and Schedule appear twice. Could you please clarify if this is a duplication?

Response

Yes, this is a duplication. Please ignore the second Work Plan and Schedule section (originally #8 in the initial RFP posted on June 13, 2025). We have amended the original RFP to remove this duplication and posted the amended RFP, which can be accessed online at <https://www.sta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/RFP-2025-06-Addendum.Final-07.14.25-1.pdf>.

11. We are asking for confirmation that the appendix containing past project examples is excluded from the 10-page limit?

Response

Yes, the appendix containing past project examples is excluded from the 10-page limit.

12. Would STA consider increasing the page limit to 16 pages to allow for more comprehensive responses?

Response

No, the 10-page limit is a firm requirement; however, proposers are encouraged to submit additional supporting materials as appendices.

13. Would STA allow for a 11x 17 page for org charts or diagrams? Would that be considered 1 or 2 pages?

Response

No, this RFP will not allow submission of 11x17 documents as part of the 10-page limit. However, appendices containing charts and diagrams can be 11x17.

14. Submittal Requirements Order: May we reorganize the order of the Submittal Requirements to create a more cohesive and concise narrative, provided all requested content is included?

Response

Yes, proposers can reorganize the order of the Submittal Requirements to create a more cohesive and concise narrative, provided all requested content is included.

15. Scope of Proposal Tasks:

Should our proposal include narrative, scope, and budget for Tasks 1–5 only, excluding Task 6 (Final Design) and the optional tasks?

Response

Your proposal should include narrative, scope, and budget for all the tasks identified in the RFP starting on page 4 including for Tasks 1 – 5, as well as the supplemental and optional tasks as STA will be issuing supplemental task order(s) to the selected consultant for completion of the supplemental and optional tasks.

16. Scope of Proposal Tasks:

We note that pricing for Design Support During Construction is difficult to estimate at this stage. Should you require us to provide a budget for the optional tasks, could you please clarify the associated scope assumptions as well as the construction duration?

Response

Similar to the response provided for question #15, as we will be issuing a supplemental task order to provide design support services during construction, we require the budget estimate for this task to be included with the proposal. The associated scope assumption is that once funding is available to move forward with design and construction, the STA anticipates retaining the services of the consultant selected in this RFP to complete PS&E, coordinate with Caltrans and Union Pacific, and provide design support during construction. We have not anticipated the duration of the construction at this time, but hoping to complete it within 12 months. Key Team Members from the selected consultant are expected to be committed for the duration of the project. Replacement of Key Team Members will not be permitted without prior consultation with and approval of the STA.

17. References Requirement: Page 13 requests three references from recent work. Some of our staff have been dedicated to large, long-term projects. Would STA consider allowing fewer references in such cases, and also extending the timeframe from 3 to 5 years?

Response

This RFP requires at least three references from recent work whether on active (long-term) or completed projects.

18. Selection Criteria Weighting: Could you please clarify how the selection criteria will be weighted? Are all criteria considered equally, or are some weighted more heavily?

Response

The selection criteria identified on page 14 of the RFP will be weighed differently and some criteria will be worth more than others. The criteria on project understanding and approach, as well as experience with similar types of projects will be scored the most.

19. Will you provide the list of attendees at the meeting on July 1, 2025, so we might reach out to each other to explore teaming possibilities?

Response

The list of consultants can be found on this document as Attachment A. Additionally, Attachment B shows the list of consultants that this RFP was distributed to when it was released.

20. Will you be posting the presentation and attendance sheet?

Response

The presentation is already posted on STA's website, which can be accessed at <https://www.sta.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Solano-Rail-Hub-Pre-Proposal-Meeting.pdf>. Meanwhile, the attendance list for the pre-proposal meeting is attached to this document as Attachment A. This document also includes Attachment B, which shows the list of consultants that this RFP was initially distributed.

21. Can you discuss the station area improvements – plaza and parking lot/circulation?

Response

The plaza and parking lot circulation in terms of bike/ped is dependent on the downtown development plans of Cities of Fairfield and Suisun City. Suisun City has an aggressive plan to redevelop its downtown waterfront and the area around the Solano Rail Hub train station.

22. Has a CEQA and NEPA lead agency been determined?

Response

No, we have not determined the CEQA and NEPA lead agency to date. However, it is anticipated that STA will take the lead.

23. What has been the involvement of Union Pacific so far?

Response

Union Pacific has not been a participant yet for this RFP. However, they have been involved with Amtrak's separate ADA platform improvements project, as well as been involved with the discussion on the existing column supporting the existing pedestrian bridge that is on UPRR's right-of-way, which is in the way for any track improvement.

24. Have you determined the delivery method for construction (CMBC, CMAR, Design-bid-build, etc)?

Response

The construction method will be design-bid-build.

25. Can you list on the website who are the prime and subconsultant in order to hook up and teaming.

Response

Please refer to Attachments A and B of this document to see, respectively, the list of consultants who attended the pre-proposal meeting and the list of consultants that this RFP was distributed to initially when it was advertised.

26. Can you touch on the source of funding and going over the DBE requirement?

Response

The source of funding for this RFP is Regional Measure 3. The DBE goal identified is 22 percent and refers to the amount of work we anticipate sub-consultants will perform. While there is no federal funding at this point, we anticipate using federal funds in the future and we don't want to preclude use of these federal funds.

27. When do you anticipate the design to be finalized?

Response

The STA at this time cannot definitively provide a schedule on when design will be finalized as there are too many questions that will need to be answered first including questions to sources of funding for 100% design, right-of-way acquisition and utility relocations, as well as construction.

28. Given all that is going on in Solano County, adding this project to the mix, can you touch on how crucial the outreach and stakeholder piece?

Response

We want to make sure to get the public's involvement in this RFP to compete well for state and federal funding. Public input is critical for shaping the project. Public engagement will be required to determine the desires of the community.

29. Any consideration for the NEPA lead agency?

Response

The STA, at this point, will prefer to be the lead. However, if Caltrans is going to be a partner, Caltrans will be the lead for NEPA.

30. Has there been any UP coordination and project funding identified?

Response

Please refer to the response for question #23 for any UP coordination. The STA has not identified any project funding beyond the PA&ED phase. This is one of the reasons that we've added an optional task #2 in the RFP for grant preparation.

Attachment A: Pre-Proposal Meeting List of Attendees

2025-06 RFP Pre-Proposal Meeting RSVP List	2025-06 RFP Pre-Proposal Meeting Attendance Sheet
Consultant Name	Consultant Name
Arup	Arup
BioMaAs Inc	BioMaAs Inc
BKF Engineers	BKF Engineers
Chaudhary & Associates, Inc.	Chaudhary & Associates, Inc.
Circlepoint	Circlepoint
Conсор	Convey Inc
Convey Inc	Earth Mechanics, Inc.
Dokken Engineering	GFT Infrastructure
Earth Mechanics, Inc.	JMA Civil Inc.
Fehr & Peers	Mark Thomas
GFT Infrastructure	Merrill Morris
JMA Civil Inc.	MGE Engineering
Mark Thomas	Perkins Eastman
Merrill Morris	RHAA Landscape Architecture
MGE Engineering	Royal Electric
Monarch Engineers	Sanbell
Perkins Eastman	SS Consultants
RHAA Landscape Architecture	Stantec
Royal Electric	Titan Global Management
Sanbell	TJKM
SS Consultants	WMH
Stantec	
Titan Global Management	
TJKM	
Towill, Inc.	
Tully Consulting Group	
WMH	

Attachment B: RFP 2025 Solano Rail Hub PA&ED Phase Consultant Distribution List

Aanko Technologies, Inc	Flint Builders, Inc	Parisi Associates
Abrams Associates Traffic Engineering	Forward City Labs	Phillippi Engineering, Inc.
ACE Quality Control	Foulk Civil Engineering Inc.	Pinto & Partners
AECOM	Gates + Associates	PlaceWorks
Alan Zahradnik	Gerry Raycraft Land Use Planning	PLS Surveys, Inc
Alta Planning + Design	GHD, Inc	Psomas
AMC Consulting Engineers, Inc	Ghirardelli Associates	Quincy Engineering
AnchorCM	Griffin Structures, Inc.	RailPros, Inc.
Anil Verma Associates, Inc.	H.W. Lochner, Inc.	Raimi + Associates
ANSE Structural Engineer	HDR Engineering, Inc.	Rajappan & Meyer Consulting
Ardurra Group Inc.	Hill International, Inc	RHAA Landscape Architects
ARUP	HMH	S & C Engineers Inc
ARWS - Associated Right of Way	ICF	Salabar Associates, Inc
Atkins North America, Inc	Integrated Marketing Systems (IMS)	Salabar Associates, Inc
Bellecci & Associates	Intelligent Imaging Systems, Inc	Sousa Land Surveys, Inc.
Bennett Engineering Services	Jacobs	SS Consultants
BIA- Bay Area	Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc	State Coastal Conservancy
BioMaAs	JMA Civil, Inc.	STV Incorporated
BKF Engineers	Joni L. Janecki & Associates, Inc	Terra Realty Advisors, Inc
Blackburn Consulting	Keadjian Associates	Titan Global Management, Inc.
Brian Fulfroast and Associates	Kimley-Horn Associates	TJKM
Burke, Williams, Sorensen, LLP	Kittelson & Associates, Inc	Toole Design Group
Burleson Consulting, Inc	KKCS	Towill, Inc
Burns Engineering Group	Leshner Planning LLC	TrailPeople
CAL Inc	Mahalat Engineering Corporation	Transportation Management &
Cambridge Systematics Inc	Mark Thomas & Company	TranSystems
Carlile Macy	Materials Testing, Inc. KC Engineering	TRC
CBEC Eco-Engineering	McElroy Transit - Public Transit	Triple HS DBA H.T. Harvey &
CDM Smith, Inc	Mead & Hunt	TSG Enterprise Inc DBA The Solis
Chaudhary & Associates Inc (DBE, SBE)	Merill Morris Partners, Landscape	Tully Consulting Group
CHS Consulting Group	MGE Engineering, Inc.	Ty Lin International
Circlepoint	Michael Baker International	U.S. Gain
CivicKnit	MNS Engineers	UNICO Engineering, Inc.
Conzor Engineers, LLC	Moffatt & Nichol	Vaca Valley Excavating & Trucking, Inc.
Creegan & D'Angelo Infrastructure	Moffatt & Nichol	Vali Cooper & Associates, Inc.
Cullen-Sherry & Associates, Inc.	Monarch Engineers	VanderToolen Associates, Inc
DBK Advisory Services, LLC	Moore & Associates, Inc	Vanir Construction Management, Inc
Dewberry Engineers Inc.	Mountain Pacific Surveys	William R. Gray & Co., DBA Gray-
DKS Associates	Nelson Nygaard	WMH Corporation
Dodge Data & Analytics	Nichols Berman	WRA, Inc
Dokken Engineering	Ninyo & Moore	WRA, Inc
DWL Transit Consulting LLC	NV5	WRECO
Economic & Planning Systems	NWC Partners	WSP
Elite Transportation Group, Inc.	Olberding Environmental, Inc	W-Trans
ESE Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Opticos Design, Inc.	Zander Design, Landscaping
Fehr & Peers	Pacific Legacy, Inc.	Zoon Engineering