



California High-Speed Rail **BRIEFING: April 27, 2022, Agenda Item #4**

TO: Chairman Richard and Board Members

FROM: Margaret Cederoth, Director of Planning and Sustainability

DATE: April 27-28, 2022

RE: Request Board Approval to Release a Request for Qualifications for Design Services for Central Valley Stations

Summary

To complete passenger rail service on the initial operating segment between Merced and Bakersfield, functional passenger stations scaled to this phase of high-speed rail service must be designed. Staff is therefore recommending the Board approve the issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Design Services for Central Valley Stations.

If approved, staff will issue an Architectural & Engineering (A&E) procurement seeking to contract with a single consultant to provide complete design services to progress the four Central Valley Stations to commissioned facilities. Offerors will be qualified to perform the entire scope of work during the RFQ process.

The Scope of Work for this Agreement will be delivered with two separately funded Notices to Proceed (NTP). The first notice to proceed (NTP 1) will advance the design of the four stations to Configuration Footprint for the facilities necessary for passenger service for the initial operating segment. The work in NTP 1 shall not exceed \$35.3 million.

At the completion of NTP 1, the Authority will have the sole discretion to progress the design to final design and construction ready documents, construction administration support, and commissioning (NTP 2). Prior to exercising this option, Authority staff will request and obtain Board approval.

Background

Stations have been included in the business model for the high-speed rail system since its inception. Stations are the access point for customers to the high-speed rail system. Requirements as to number and provisions regarding station locations are specified in the Streets and Highways Code [Division 3, Chapter 20, 2704.09]. The Federal Grant Agreement (California High-Speed Train Program ARRA Grant) also includes the provision that the Authority should treat stations “as a new city gateway – consider the station’s form and spaces,

both primary and secondary (backside, underside); the station's place-making effects and iconic and readily identifiable design."

Prior Board Action

Both the 2020 Business Plan and 2022 Draft Business Plan state that advancing design on the Central Valley Stations is a key activity to advancing toward electrified high-speed rail passenger service by the end of the decade. The 2020 Business Plan was adopted by the Authority Board of Directors on Thursday, March 25, 2021, and submitted to the state legislature on Monday, April 12, 2021. This proposed station procurement is consistent with the 2020 Business Plan priority of expanding the 119-mile segment in the Central Valley to develop 171 miles of electrified high-speed rail service by advancing design of the four stations. The 2022 Business Plan Draft includes the same priority and notes: "Advancing station designs will clarify a number of issues with local stakeholders including station site boundaries and station access projects across all modes—bikes, pedestrian and transit."

This RFQ contains station sites located in the Merced to Fresno Project Section, the Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section, and the Fresno to Bakersfield Supplemental environmental documents for the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA). The Authority Board certified the Final EIR/EIS for Merced to Fresno on May 3, 2012, and filed a Notice of Determination (NOD) with the State Clearinghouse on May 4, 2012. FRA issued the Record of Decision (ROD) on September 18, 2012.

The Authority Board certified the Final EIR/EIS for Fresno to Bakersfield on May 7, 2014, and filed a NOD with the State Clearinghouse on May 8, 2014. FRA issued its ROD on June 27, 2014. Additionally, the Final Supplemental EIR for the LGA was certified by the Authority Board on October 6, 2018, and a NOD was filed with the State Clearinghouse on October 7, 2018. The Combined ROD and Final Supplemental EIS for the LGA was issued on November 8, 2019.

Discussion

Authority staff seeks approval to issue a RFQ to qualify teams for a new A&E contract to be managed by the Authority's Planning and Sustainability Branch to support the delivery of a comprehensive design package for the four Central Valley Stations on the initial operating segment: Merced, Fresno, Kings/Tulare, and Bakersfield. Work on a Madera station is being led by the San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority.

The draft RFQ (subject to revision based upon Board action and direction), including a sample agreement and scope of work, is publicly available on the California State Contracts Register here: www.caleprocure.ca.gov.

Stations are a critical element of the high-speed rail system, enabling passenger access to the system. The Authority has long-established performance criteria for the passenger stations, including that they be easy to maintain, universally accessible, seamlessly integrate a range of transportation modes (including buses, bicycles, pedestrian pathways, other rail systems, and automobiles), and feature design characteristics that make them readily identifiable as high-speed rail stations. Their sustainability performance is a requirement and a part of minimizing operations costs through design that maximizes natural ventilation, achieves zero-net energy performance through onsite energy generation, and maximizes the efficient use and reuse of water resources. NTP 1 and NTP 2 contract activities include the following:

1. Contract Administration and Project Management
2. Pre-Design/Planning Services (Preliminary design concepts, cost estimate and schedule)
3. Design Services (Schematic, Design Development, 50%, 100%, Regulatory Approvals, Ready to Bid)
4. Bid Support
5. Construction Administration Support
6. Commissioning Support

NTP 1 comprises the design work necessary to define the Configuration Footprint for each station site. The Configuration Footprint defines the physical extent of the station footprint to serve as a baseline for any right-of-way acquisition beyond the ROD footprint as well as utility requirements, the selection and refinement of materials for station components, and additional work on select components. The work in NTP 1 shall not exceed \$35.3 million and includes the following deliverables and tasks:

1. Project Configuration Footprint
2. Cost estimate updates
3. Value engineering
4. Building information modelling and asset management
5. Sustainability and climate analyses
6. Facilities programming
7. Updated project risk assessment and schedule
8. Site Investigation, survey, and analysis

NTP 2 comprises the remaining work, including final design, bid support, construction administration support, and commissioning support, through completion of commissioning for the station facilities, for each station. The estimated amount for NTP 2 is \$36 million and would bring the total not-to-exceed amount for this Agreement to \$71.3 million.

Executing NTP 2 to complete activities post-Configuration Footprint will require additional funding and Board approval.

The delivery method selected for the Central Valley stations is design-bid-build (DBB). The DBB method was selected because it provides the Authority with a process and tools to directly manage design quality and certainty, cost control, stakeholder relationships, and mitigate cost uncertainty.

Building out the Stations in a Phased Manner

Station Building Blocks are scaled to system phases (Initial Operating Segment, Valley to Valley, Phase 1) and comprise the physical scope required for passenger facilities in a given station to accommodate that operating phase. Building Block 1 includes those elements required for the Initial Operating Segment, both landside and trackside, and represents the minimum necessary for a functional passenger station.

The selected designer will advance detailed design for Building Block 1 for all four stations. The designer will produce cost estimates and carry out value engineering exercises targeted to available funds. Given that some components of the stations must be scaled to accommodate future ridership levels, the selected designer will also advance design to Configuration Footprint on Building Blocks 2 and 3 for the purposes of future proofing the Building Block 1 final design. The objective is to avoid rework, throw-away costs and to further refine cost estimates.

Building Blocks

Building Block 1	Building Block 2	Building Block 3
Elements required for safe, comfortable passenger service that present risk if built later	Additional elements to accommodate ridership increases with Valley to Valley	Any additional space
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Platforms 2. Canopies 3. Vertical Circulation & Concourse 4. Functional and operations spaces, including crew space 5. Site: Parking (ADA, Bike, Automobile) 6. Site: Transit facilities (bus stops) 7. Site: Pick-up and drop-off 8. Station access, particularly roadways 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Station Headhouse 2. Functional spaces (crew space, other) 3. Structured parking 4. Transit facilities 5. Additional roadway access 	Additional spaces to accommodate Phase 1 ridership

Procurement Process

To create a competitive and fair procurement environment, staff recommends a process that includes an RFQ, where Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) are submitted and selection is based upon qualifications; this procurement method does not require a second step or RFP. Negotiations with the highest ranked offeror will follow to agree upon terms, including fair and reasonable compensation.

The legal authority for this process can be found at: Government Code Section 4529.10-4529.20 (authority to secure A&E services via a qualifications-based selection process), 21 California Code of Regulations sections 10000-10000.7 (the procedures applicable to secure A&E services) and Public Utilities Code section 185036 (Authority power to award contracts with private or public entities for the design, construction, and operation of high-speed rail trains).

Procurement Schedule

The anticipated schedule for this procurement is intended to allow for the contract to be executed and issue NTP 1 in October of 2022. The schedule has been sequenced to avoid conflicts with ongoing Authority procurements.

RFQ Activity	Date
RFQ advertised on Cal eProcure	April 29, 2022, or the Week of March 2-6, 2022
Pre-Bid Conference	May12, 2022
SOQs due	July 19, 2022
Anticipated Notice of Proposed Award Released	August, 2022
Presentation to Board: Contract Award	October 20, 2022
Contract Execution and Notice to Proceed (NTP 1)	October 2022

RFQ Evaluation Criteria

The RFQ process will be managed by Authority staff. The SOQs submitted by the offerors will be reviewed to ensure that all technical, requisite qualifications, and other RFQ requirements are met.

The SOQs will first be evaluated for pass-fail elements contained in the RFQ, among which is a pass-fail requirement related to the offeror's environmental, social, and governance (ESG) efforts, which may include any environmental sustainability efforts, socio-economic equity policies, and governance policies, or a report that conforms to certain sustainability frameworks identified in the RFQ.

For purposes of this requirement, "socio-economic equity" means making opportunities and benefits available to all applicants, employees, and affected community members regardless of socioeconomic status and decision making that balances the effects of decisions on vulnerable and underserved communities and individuals regardless of income, race, ethnicity, age, gender, or other factors. The social factors of the ESG criteria complies with Article I, Section 31 of the California Constitution, which was added by Proposition 209 in 1996 and prohibits discrimination or "preferential treatment" on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in public contracting.

The SOQs will then be evaluated and scored by the Evaluation Selection Committee pursuant to established criteria in the accompanying draft RFQ, which will include the following:

1. Past Performance and Experience

- Has the Offeror successfully delivered on past projects of similar scope and complexity?
- Has the Offeror demonstrated sufficient experience on past projects performing the tasks required under the Scope of Work?
- Has the Offeror demonstrated successful partnering and collaboration in a team environment on past projects of similar scope and complexity?

2. Organization and Proposed Team

- Does the proposed project organization present a clear and logical framework?
- Is the management approach responsive to the RFQ requirements and does it address the full expanse of potential tasks in the scope?
- Does the management approach convey the proper level of response for the Work?

Key Personnel

- Are the personal qualifications and professional skills of the project manager, senior professionals and Key Personnel nominees appropriate for the roles assigned?
- Is the past experience applicable and indicative of success on this project?
- Does the project manager have sufficient experience to effectively lead and manage the project?

3. Understanding of Project Requirements

- Has the Offeror demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the project?
- Is there sufficient evidence of analysis to lend credibility to the commitments made?
- Has the Offeror given clear evidence through narratives and examples of prior work that it has the capability to carry out the Work for a project of this complexity and magnitude with innovation and autonomy?

4. Small Business Utilization

- Does the Offeror commit to meeting the Authority's SB goal?
- Does the Offeror's SB narrative clearly identify how the Offeror will utilize SBs to achieve the Authority's SB goal?

At the conclusion of the SOQ evaluations, the Evaluation Selection Committee will rank the offerors on the basis of their SOQ scores. In accordance with the Board policy related to RFQs, the Authority will invite selected offerors to participate in discussions with the Evaluation Selection Committee. Discussions will be held with no fewer than the top three most qualified offerors, unless fewer than three SOQs are received. Discussions will be evaluated and scored by the Evaluation Selection Committee.

For each offeror invited for discussion, the Evaluation Selection Committee will compute a final score, which is the sum of the offeror's weighted SOQ score and weighted Discussion score. Discussion evaluation criteria and final score computation will be provided in the RFQ. The discussion evaluation criteria are as follows:

1. Presentation

- Quality and appropriateness of the presentation
- Logic of the chosen speakers relative to project challenges
- Project Manager control over the team

2. Project Manager Participation

- Clear and responsive answers to questions
- Understanding of Project challenges and requirements
- Perceived level of involvement with SOQ structure, content, and presentation plan

3. Key Staff Participation

- Clear and responsive answers to questions
- Understanding of assignment challenges and requirements
- Perceived level of involvement with SOQs preparation
- Demonstration of an integrated team displaying awareness and understanding of the design process

4. Understanding of Project

- The Offeror conveys an understanding of the critical project success factors
- The Offeror provides evidence of successful SB utilization for this Project

- The Offeror provides evidence of prior project experience, including lessons learned or challenges with projects of this magnitude and complexity

Based upon the scoring in the draft RFQ, the offeror with the highest final score shall be ranked number one and recommended to the Authority's Chief Executive Officer for contract award and Board approval will be requested before executing a contract.

Additional Provisions

SMALL BUSINESS: As provided in the draft RFQ, the resulting contract is subject to Small Business (SB), Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) and Disadvantaged Business Entity (DBE) participation goals in compliance with state and federal law. The agreement between the Authority and the consultant will include the Board's adopted 30 percent overall SB utilization goal, which includes a ten percent race-neutral DBE participation goal and a three percent DVBE goal.

Legal Approval

The Legal Office has reviewed this RFQ and the relevant laws, regulations and policies, and deems this RFQ to be legally sufficient for release.

Budget and Fiscal Impact

This request is to release an RFQ in order to procure a new A&E contract in an initial not-to-exceed amount of \$35.3 million to complete the Configuration Footprint design work (NTP 1). The procurement and resulting contract include an option related to completing final design, construction ready documents, and commissioning for all four stations (NTP 2).

This request, however, is only for authorization for the initial not-to-exceed amount of \$35.3 million. When the Authority seeks to exercise the NTP 2 option, which is estimated at an additional \$24 to 36 million, staff will return to the Board for approval to fund the option to progress to final design, construction administration support and commissioning.

Capital Outlay Costs

The funds associated with this request include State and federal sources, including State Cap and Trade funds. The request for NTP 1 is consistent with the Expenditure Authorization approved at the December 2021 board meeting. Upon approval, this request will allocate budget reserved for this work within the 2022 Expenditure Authorization to the Design Services for Central Valley Stations contract up to \$35.3 million.

2021-22 Fiscal Year Budget

Contract Name	Contract Number	Current FY Contract Budget	Budget Change	Funding Source
Merced Station SG3	SLPP0452-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Fresno Station SG3	SLPP0450-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Kings/Tulare Station SG3	SLPP0451-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Bakersfield Station SG3	SLPP0453-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Merced Station SG3 Cont	CONT0452-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Fresno Station SG3 Cont	CONT0450-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Kings/Tulare Station SG3 Cont	CONT0451-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Bakersfield Station SG3 Cont	CONT0453-001	\$0	-\$0	State and Federal
Central Valley Station Design	HSR-PEND-21-22-21.01	\$0	+\$0	State and Federal
Total			\$0	

Total Program Budget

Contract Name	Contract Number/Budget Allocation	Current Total Program Contract Budget	Budget Change	Funding Source
Merced Station SG3	SLPP0452-001		-\$7,243,598	State and Federal
Fresno Station SG3	SLPP0450-001		-\$7,243,598	State and Federal
Kings/Tulare Station SG3	SLPP0451-001		-\$7,243,598	State and Federal
Bakersfield Station SG3	SLPP0453-001		-\$7,243,598	State and Federal
Merced Station SG3 Cont	CONT0452-001		-\$1,581,402	State and Federal
Fresno Station SG3 Cont	CONT0450-001		-\$1,581,402	State and Federal
Kings/Tulare Station SG3 Cont	CONT0451-001		-\$1,581,402	State and Federal
Bakersfield Station SG3 Cont	CONT0453-001		-\$1,581,402	State and Federal
Central Valley Station Design	HSR-PEND-21-22-21.01		+\$35,300,000	State and Federal
Total			\$0	

REVIEWER INFORMATION	SIGNATURE
Reviewer Name and Title: Brian Annis Chief Financial Officer	Signature verifying budget analysis: Signed April 20, 2022
Reviewer Name and Title: Alicia Fowler Chief Counsel	Signature verifying legal analysis: Signed April 20, 2022

Recommendations

Staff is requesting approval to issue a RFQ for Design Services for the Central Valley Stations in a total contract value up to \$35.3 million for NTP 1 and to make any necessary modifications to the RFQ as part of the procurement process. Authority staff will seek additional Board approval(s) prior to proceeding with NTP 2.

Attachments