

Addendum #1
**RFQ #05-26 Request for Qualifications to Design and Build the Next
Generation Transit Facility**

RFQ 05-26 Question and Answers
September 18, 2026

Questions Submitted:

1. In Division 4, paragraph 3 and 4, the RFQ notes to complete Form H and Form I Score Sheet for minimum qualifications. Please confirm if these 2 forms are to be submitted in our Statement of Qualifications.

Yes. Section 5 – Required Forms lists all forms that must be included in the Statement of Qualifications.

2. The key personnel titles listed in the RFQ do not align with standard construction industry terminology. Please confirm that the roles of Project Manager, On-Site Project Manager, and Start-Up Manager are contractor-provided positions and may correspond to different titles used by individual firms. Likewise, please confirm that the roles of Principal Engineer and Lead Design Engineer may be provided by the Architect of Record and may be represented by different titles depending on the firm's organizational structure.

Yes. The titles identified in the RFQ are intended to define the required roles, responsibilities, qualifications, and accountability, rather than prescribe specific industry-standard job titles. DB Entitys may use equivalent titles consistent with their organizational structure, provided the proposed personnel meet all applicable RFQ requirements and perform the specified responsibilities.

The Project Manager, On-Site Project Manager, and Start-Up Manager are contractor-provided roles. The Principal Engineer and Lead Design Engineer may be provided by the Architect of Record. Regardless of title or organizational structure, the selected Design-Builder will remain responsible for ensuring that all required functions are adequately staffed and performed by qualified personnel in accordance with the Contract Documents.

3. 'Principal Engineering Firm' is referred to 23 times in the RFQ. Architect is referred to only four times (as part of the Principal Engineering Firm form). Is Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority seeking licensed Professional Engineers (PE) to fulfill the Principal Engineering Firm role? If so, will a Principal Structural Engineer (SE) suffice? Can professionally licensed Architects act as the Principal Engineering Firm?

The Principal Engineering Firm shall be a California-licensed engineering firm qualified to perform the engineering services required under the RFQ. A Principal

Structural Engineer (SE) may fulfill the role, provided all applicable licensing and qualification requirements are met. A licensed Architect may serve as the Principal Engineering Firm only if the firm is also properly licensed and qualified to perform the required engineering services.

4. Please confirm what Stage 1 and Stage 2 refer to under Division 8, section A. 2 and 3.

Division 8 A.2: Please show working relationship with subcontractors and describe how the subcontractors will be managed to form a coherent team.

Division 8 A.3: Show key personnel and the line of command for reporting so there are clear lines of communication and contacts.

5. Please confirm that 11" x 17" paper may be used for organization charts and project schedules submitted with the proposal.

Yes, 11x17 paper can be utilized.

6. Clarify how we indicate on Form J which 3 GC projects we want scored.

Include at least 2 copies of Form J with a specific project on each copy.

7. How is the scoring broken down for Division 5 Reference Projects?

The Authority's assessment of project experience will also include, but are not limited to, reference checks from project owners. For at least two (2) reference projects, the Authority may interview the Owner Reference identified on Form J Reference Project Data Sheet to verify the information provided. The Authority reserves the right to disqualify a project for consideration where the Owner Reference demonstrates a lack of knowledge regarding the specifics of the project in question and for the DB Entity's performance on that project.

8. Regarding Division 1 – Design-Build Entity Information and Certification, please clarify the Authority's requirements for the legal structure of the Design-Build Entity.

The RFQ states that if the legal entity constituting the Design-Build Entity has not yet been formed, questions should be answered as if it has been formed. Form A also includes execution requirements for a "Firm That Has Not Yet Been Formed."

However, Section 2.9 states that where two or more proposing companies desire to submit a single qualification, they should do so on a prime-subcontractor basis rather than as a joint venture, and that the Authority intends to contract with a single firm.

- a. Please confirm whether an existing California-licensed General Contractor may serve as the Design-Build Entity and prime contracting party to the Authority,

with the Principal Engineering Firm, architectural firm(s), and other design consultants identified as members of the Design-Build Team and retained under subcontract/consultant agreements to the Design-Build Entity.

The General Contractor may serve as the Design-Build Entity and Prime contracting party with subcontractors fulfilling other ancillary responsibilities.

- b. Under this structure, please also confirm that the General Contractor would identify its existing corporation as the Design-Build Entity on Form A and would not be required to form a new corporation, partnership, joint venture, LLC, or other separate legal entity with its design/engineering team members.

Correct, the existing corporation can be the Design-Build Entity.

- c. On Form J: Reference Project Data Sheet, the Project Delivery Method section currently lists the following options: Corporation, Sole Proprietorship, Corporation, and Other. We assume these selections were included in error, as they appear to describe business entity types rather than project delivery methods. Please confirm whether this is the case. If so, we kindly request that the form be revised to include the appropriate project delivery method options for selection.

A correction has been made, and the form is available on the solicitation website.

- 9. Section 3.3 states that it is not anticipated that the Design-Builder will be required to conduct environmental studies related to the Project. Section 3.5, however, states that the Design-Builder's responsibilities may include obtaining "all necessary site investigations, studies, and all other information to design and construct the Project." Section 3.6 further states that the Authority will furnish existing preliminary and environmental studies and will provide, or engage the Design-Builder to perform, additional studies necessary to complete the Project.
At the proposal phase, the Authority will make all available environmental documentation accessible to eligible Proposers. Any additional studies, surveys, site investigations, or other information determined necessary by the Design-Builder to complete the Project shall be the sole responsibility of the Design-Builder. The project has received a Categorical Exclusion for NEPA and a Statutory Exclusion for CEQA.

- 10. Can Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority provide a space needs program/requirements identifying the spatial needs of the site and facilities?

This information is not necessary to complete the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at this step in the procurement process. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.

11. Can Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority provide the design documents, bridging documents, and/or performance specifications for this project?
This information is not necessary to complete the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at this step in the procurement process. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.
12. Is a site survey with grading and utilities been completed for the site? Or is the design-build team responsible for completing?
Yes. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.
13. In section 3.5, bullet point 2 notes that the Design-Builder is required to obtain all necessary site investigations, studies, etc. Please clarify what items are anticipated for the DB to obtain. Is a site geotechnical / soil borings report been completed for the site? Or is the design-build team responsible for completing?
See response to #9.
14. Has the Project completed environmental review/clearance under CEQA and, if applicable due to the use of federal funding, NEPA? If so, please identify the applicable environmental document(s), determination(s), and/or clearance(s), and advise whether these documents will be provided to the shortlisted Design-Build teams.
Both NEPA (Categorical Exclusion) and CEQA (Statutory Exemption) have been completed and documents will be provided to the shortlisted design-build firms.
15. Does the Authority anticipate any additional environmental review, environmental studies, mitigation measures, permitting, or agency coordination being required during final design or construction? If so, please identify which responsibilities will be retained by the Authority and which will be assigned to the Design-Builder.
See response to #9. Both NEPA (Categorical Exclusion) and CEQA (Statutory Exemption) have been completed, and compliance with these approvals is the responsibility of the Design-Builder.
16. Please confirm whether the Design-Builder will be entitled to rely upon environmental reports, geotechnical information, surveys, utility information, and other site investigations furnished by the Authority for purposes of design, pricing, and construction.
The Design-Builder may rely upon information furnished by the Authority for purposes of design, pricing, and construction; however, the Design-Builder remains responsible for independently reviewing and verifying the information as necessary to perform the Work. The Authority does not warrant the completeness or accuracy of such information.

17. Please clarify what is intended by the Design-Builder's responsibility to obtain "all necessary site investigations, studies, and all other information" under Section 3.5. Specifically, please identify which existing site investigations and studies will be provided by the Authority and which additional investigations or studies are anticipated to be the Design-Builder's responsibility. Examples may include geotechnical investigations, hazardous materials/environmental site assessments, utility investigations, surveying, groundwater, cultural resources, biological resources, or other site-specific investigations.

See response to #9 and #14. These studies are not required for this phase of the project and will be addressed at a later date.

18. Has Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority engaged with any permitting, regulatory, or approval agencies regarding the project to date? If so, please provide a summary of any pre-application meetings, agency consultations, comments received, identified concerns, or potential permitting challenges that may influence the design, schedule, cost, or procurement approach.

This information is not necessary to complete the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at this step in the procurement process. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.

19. Please clarify the anticipated level of development of the initial design package that will be provided to the selected Design-Builder. Specifically, what design phase or percentage completion (e.g., programming, conceptual, schematic design, design development, or other) should the Design-Builder expect to receive at contract award?

The project is currently at approximately 30% design.

20. Is this project under the jurisdiction of the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM)?
No.

21. What is the makeup of the Selection Committee and what aspect(s) of the project do they represent (e.g. end users, project administrators)?

The Selection Committee may consist of Authority staff, representatives of the local jurisdiction, Authority Board members, and/or Authority consultants.

22. Is a plan holder list available for review?

No.

23. Is a cost estimate required as part of the qualification's submission at this stage of the procurement process?

No.

24. The current deadline for the completed qualifications submission is **3:00 PM (PST) on October 2, 2026**. Given the scope and complexity of the requirements, the timeline is quite aggressive for thoroughly evaluating the requirements, developing a comprehensive response, and preparing a high-quality submission. Therefore, we respectfully request a **two-week extension** to the submission deadline to allow sufficient time for proposal development.

The Authority has determined that sufficient time has been provided in the current schedule for this phase, which is focused on gathering Design-Builder team qualifications. Accordingly, the schedule will remain unchanged at this time, subject to any future adjustments the Authority may determine necessary.

25. Section 1.0 states the respondent must possess either a valid Class A or Class B contractor's license. Form E, Question 1 - an automatic-disqualification question - asks only whether the General Contractor possesses a valid and current California Class "B" General Building Contractor's License. Will a General Contractor holding a Class A General Engineering license (without a Class B) be deemed responsive? Please confirm or revise Form E, Question 1 accordingly.

A General Contractor holding a valid California Class A General Engineering Contractor's License, without a Class B license, will be deemed responsive, provided all other applicable licensing and solicitation requirements are satisfied. Form E has been revised.

26. Form E, Question 4 asks whether the DB Entity can obtain performance and payment bonds "for the Project, which is expected to involve a construction contract cost as defined in Section 2.3 of this RFQ." Section 2.3 is titled "RFQ Forms" and contains no cost definition. Please confirm the intended cross-reference (presumably Section 3.2, Project Budget, and/or Section 2.15, Bonds).

As stated in Section 3.2, the Project Design-Build budget is \$50,000,000 - \$60,000,000.

27. Section 2.15 requires bonds "in the full amount of the estimated construction costs" and states the estimated construction cost is "100% of the Project Value indicated in Section 3." Section 3.2 defines Project Value as \$50,000,000-\$60,000,000, and Division 5 defines "Project Value" to include engineering design costs, start-up, testing, commissioning, and post-construction services. (a) Must bonds be provided on the full Project Value including design and post-construction services, or on construction cost only? (b) What single dollar figure must the surety's notarized statement address - \$50M, \$60M, or another value?

Yes, bonds must be provided on the full Project Value including construction, design, and post-construction services. Respondents must provide a notarized statement from the Surety Company stating the amount of bonding currently available to the DB Entity for the estimated contract cost (\$50,000,000-\$60,000,000). The notarized statement must be from the surety company, not an agent or broker.

28. Division 3 states a DB Entity that "fails" any one of Questions 1-20 on Form E is automatically disqualified. Form E itself applies automatic disqualification only to Questions 1-5 ("No"), 6-12 ("Yes"), and 13-16 ("No"). Questions 17 (EMR), 18 and 19 (lost work rate) are data-entry items with no stated pass/fail standard other than the note that a three-year average EMR above 1.0 "may" disqualify. Please clarify what constitutes a "failure" of Questions 17 through 20.

For question 17, the DB Entity may be disqualified if the three-year average EMR exceeds 1.0. For questions 18 through 20: The average total recordable injury and illness rate (also known as OSHA Incidence Rate) and average lost work rate (also known as the Lost Workday Incidence Rate) for the most recent three-year period must not exceed the applicable statistical standards for its business category. As an alternative, a DB Entity may be deemed to have an acceptable safety record in those categories if the DB Entity is a party to an alternative dispute resolution system, as provided for in Section 3201.5 of the Labor Code. The DB Entity is automatically disqualified if none of these requirements are met.

29. Division 4 states a DB Entity that "fails" any question from 2 to 14 on Form F "will be disqualified." Form F itself states that failure to explain a "Yes" answer to Questions 4 to 14 "may result in immediate" disqualification, and separately that failure to provide documentation for Questions 2 and 3 "may result in" disqualification. Please confirm: (a) whether an affirmative answer itself is disqualifying, or only the failure to explain/document it; and (b) whether disqualification is mandatory ("will") or discretionary ("may").

An affirmative answer to Questions 2–14 is not automatically disqualifying. However, the Authority will review the response and any required supporting documentation to determine whether the DB Entity satisfies the solicitation requirements. An affirmative response, including the circumstances disclosed and supporting documentation provided, may result in disqualification if the Authority determines that the DB Entity does not meet the applicable requirements.

30. Form H requires a minimum score of 100 against a maximum possible score of 135 - a margin of only 35 points. A large, active national contractor with an ordinary claims history could lose 10 points on F-7/F-8 (two or more claims over \$50,000 in five years), 10 points on F-15 (a single serious/willful/repeat OSHA citation carries a 10-point swing from +5 to -5), 5 points on F-18, and 7 points on F-4, and fall below the threshold despite being demonstrably more qualified than a smaller firm with no claims volume. Is this threshold intentional? Will the Authority consider explanatory context for disclosed items, or is the scoring purely mechanical?

The scoring criteria and 100-point minimum threshold apply uniformly to all firms, regardless of firm size. The scoring is intended to be applied consistently based on the information provided and is not adjusted based on a firm's size or claims volume.

31. Form H scores F-15 as "5 pts for 0 instance, -5 pts for one or more instances," with no cap and no gradation. Please confirm that a single CAL OSHA serious citation in five years produces a 10-point net swing. Also confirm whether citations that were appealed and reduced, withdrawn, reclassified, or abated are excluded, and whether the five-year period runs from the citation date or the final decision date.
Yes. A single qualifying citation results in the applicable 10-point swing under the Form H scoring criteria. The only exclusion is for a citation that the General Contractor has appealed and for which the state's OSHA Appeals Board has not yet issued a ruling. If an appeal has been decided, the citation must be reported, along with the applicable decision information. The five-year period will be measured from the date of the citation.
32. Form H lists F-21 (state-approved apprenticeship program) as "N/A" for scoring. Please confirm F-21 is informational only and that maintaining an approved apprenticeship program provides no scoring benefit.
F-21 is informational only; maintaining an approved apprenticeship program provides no scoring benefit.
33. Form I requires 67 of a maximum 92 - a 25-point margin, where G-2 and G-3 carry 12 points each. Please confirm this threshold is intentional given that an engineering firm with routine professional liability claims history (G-5/G-6 at 7 points each) has limited room before disqualification.
The scoring criteria and minimum threshold are intentional and apply uniformly to all firms. The scoring is designed to provide a consistent and equitable evaluation of each firm based on the established criteria, regardless of firm size or claims history.
34. May a DB Entity submit reference projects performed by a predecessor entity, an acquired firm, a legal-name predecessor, or a joint venture in which the General Contractor was a member? If a JV project is submitted, how will the GC's partial role be credited?
Yes. Reference projects may include projects performed by a predecessor entity, acquired firm, legal-name predecessor, or joint venture, provided the DB Entity clearly identifies its role and the relevance of the experience. For joint venture projects, credit will be based on the General Contractor's actual scope and level of responsibility on the project.
35. Section 2.13 requires all firms and Key Personnel to remain on the team through procurement and execution, and Division 6 requires resubmittal and rescoring on any change. Given that design is not anticipated to begin until Q1 2027 and construction until Q3 2027 - roughly 6 to 12 months after shortlisting - how will the Authority evaluate a Key Personnel substitution occurring between SOQ submittal and contract award? Will a substitution trigger rescoring against other shortlisted firms, and could it result in removal from the shortlist?
The Authority recognizes that extraordinary circumstances may require a change to the Project Team. Any proposed Key Personnel substitution must be submitted in writing to the Authority Contact and is subject to the Authority's approval.

Authorized substitutions will be evaluated as part of the next phase of the procurement, during the Proposal phase, in accordance with the applicable evaluation criteria. An unauthorized modification to the Project Team may result in elimination from further consideration.

36. Division 7 requires a Dun & Bradstreet report, a long-term issuer credit rating from Fitch, Moody's, or S&P, and three years of audited GAAP financial statements for each of three entities. Privately held contractors and most engineering firms do not carry issuer credit ratings, and many design firms produce reviewed or compiled rather than audited statements. (a) Confirm that a written statement of unavailability is fully sufficient with no scoring penalty. (b) How will "Bond, credit, and other ratings" (Sec. 4.1.C.4) be scored for a firm with no issuer rating - as zero, as neutral, or will surety capacity letters serve as a substitute?

A statement explaining the unavailability of a D&B report or issuer credit rating will satisfy the applicable submission requirement. However, the absence of a credit rating does not establish a specific scoring treatment. Financial Capability will be evaluated based on the information submitted in Division 7, including profitability and growth, solvency, financial efficiency, bonding, credit, and other ratings. The Authority will consider the totality of the financial information provided in evaluating each DB Entity.

37. Where the DB Entity is a to-be-formed joint venture or has no operating history, may the financial submittal for the "DB Entity" be satisfied by the financials of its members, or by the General Contractor's alone where the General Contractor is providing the bonding and balance sheet? Please confirm this does not result in a lower score for the DB Entity category.

The Authority intends to contract with a single firm, not multiple firms doing business as a joint venture.

38. The scope includes a new signalized intersection at North Beale Road and Avondale Avenue plus roadway, street lighting, and sidewalk improvements on Avondale Avenue. (a) What agency has jurisdiction over North Beale Road and Avondale Avenue (Yuba County, Caltrans, or other)? (b) Per Section 3.6, which encroachment permits, traffic signal approvals, and utility relocation agreements will the Authority obtain? (c) Is all right-of-way for the intersection and offsite improvements currently under Authority control, and if not, who bears acquisition and schedule risk?

This information is not necessary to complete the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at this step in the procurement process. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.

39. Is this project Progressive Design-Build (qualifications-based selection of one design-builder, followed by a Phase 1 preconstruction/design services agreement and a later negotiated GMP or fixed price) or Traditional Design-Build (shortlist, then a competitive RFP in which each shortlisted team submits a technical proposal and

a firm price for the whole project)? Please answer with one of those two terms. If the Authority has not yet decided, please state that plainly.

The Authority is following the traditional design-build process in accordance with California Public Contract Code 22160, under which a selected number of qualifying firms will be shortlisted and invited to move on to the competitive proposal phase of the procurement process.

40. Please define "Stage 1" and "Stage 2" as used in Division 8. What work is performed in each stage, and what contractual instrument governs each?

Respondents shall disregard "Stage 1" and "Stage 2". Firms shall demonstrate their proposed organizational structure, reporting relationships, responsibilities, and management approach for the duration of the Project, including how these will be maintained and coordinated throughout each phase of the Work.

41. If this is traditional design-build, state specifically what design deliverables each shortlisted team must submit with its RFP proposal.

RFP requirements will be provided to eligible shortlisted firms during the competitive proposal phase of the process.

42. Will the Authority award on lowest responsible price or best value? If best value, what is the weighting between price and technical/design factors? PCC §22164 requires the RFP to state this.

This information is not necessary to complete the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at this step in the procurement process. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.

43. Section 3.3 states no environmental studies are anticipated. Please confirm that CEQA and NEPA (FTA) clearance are complete and identify the approved document(s) and any mitigation measures the design-builder will inherit. If clearance is not complete, state which party carries the schedule risk if the environmental document is delayed or the project description changes.

See response to #15.

44. The RFQ scores a "Principal Engineering Firm" (Forms G and I) and requires a "Principal Engineer (Engineer of Record, having primary responsibilities for Design Services)" as Key Personnel (Division 6). This project is an administration and operations building, a vehicle maintenance building, and associated site work. On a project of this type, the lead design professional is an Architect of Record, with structural, civil, MEP, and fueling/charging engineers as subconsultants. Does the

Authority require an Architect of Record and can this position be interchangeable with a Principal Engineer?

The Authority requires an Architect of Record for the project. The Principal Engineer and Architect of Record may be the same individual, provided the individual holds all applicable California licenses and meets the qualifications and experience requirements for both positions. The individual shall perform and assume responsibility only for services within the scope of their applicable licenses.

45. May an architecture firm serve as the "Principal Engineering Firm" for purposes of Forms G and I and Division 6, or must that role be filled by an engineering firm? If it must be an engineering firm, please identify which engineering discipline the Authority expects to be the "Engineer of Record" for a vertical-building transit facility.

The Principal Engineering Firm must be qualified to provide the engineering services required for the Project and is not required to be an engineering-only firm. An architecture firm may serve as the Principal Engineering Firm if it is properly qualified and includes or retains the appropriately licensed engineering professionals necessary to perform the Project's engineering services.

46. The RFQ requires a "Start-Up Manager" as Key Personnel and evaluates "plant startup," "process optimization," and "initial operations" support (Division 6; Section 4.1.B.7–8; Division 5 definition of "Project Value"). These are process-plant/EPC criteria. Please confirm what "start-up" and "process optimization" mean for this facility (e.g., commissioning of BEB charging infrastructure, fueling systems, building systems) so that respondents can provide personnel with appropriate qualifications.

Start-up refers to the activation, testing, commissioning, and initial operation of the Project's systems and equipment, including BEB charging infrastructure, fueling systems, and building systems, to verify that each system is installed, operational, and ready for its intended use.

47. Please provide the scoring criteria for the example projects submitted by prospective teams.

Reference projects submitted on Form J will be evaluated in conjunction with the requirements outlined in Form E (DB Entity Minimum Requirements)

48. Please confirm if programming and primary space planning have been completed by AECOM/WSP.

Complete programming and space planning is the responsibility of the DB Firm. Preliminary programming and space planning are included in the Project Manual. Final programming and space planning design is the DB Firm's responsibility.

49. Please confirm if the Authority is open to changes to the design presently conceived by AECOM/WSP if they are in the interest of facility operational optimization.

Yes, subject to the requirements, the minimum requirements in the Project Manual and all authorities having jurisdiction over the project.

50. Will the RFP proposal require a firm fixed price (lump sum) for the full design and construction scope, a GMP, or only fees, general conditions, and rates (which would indicate progressive design-build)? Please state which.

Firm Fixed Price for all design and construction services.

51. Will the Authority issue the draft design-build contract with the RFP? Please identify the base form (e.g., DBIA 530/535, AIA A141, or an Authority-drafted agreement). If the agreement is Authority-drafted, please state whether it was developed for design-build or adapted from a design-bid-build or EPC form.

Yes. The Authority will issue an Authority-drafted design-build agreement with the RFP.

52. Section 4.2 states up to six firms will be shortlisted. If traditional design-build with design deliverables is intended, will the Authority consider limiting the shortlist to three firms, consistent with DBIA best practice for competitive design-build RFPs?

The Authority will determine the number of firms shortlisted based on the quality and quantity of responsive and qualified Statements of Qualifications received. While the RFQ permits the Authority to shortlist up to six firms, the Authority does not guarantee that six firms will be shortlisted. The final number will be determined based on the qualifications of the respondents and the evaluation results.

53. Sec. 4.1 (pp.28-29) - Section 4.1 allocates 40% to DB Entity/Team Experience, 40% to Key Personnel Experience, and 20% to Financial Capability, and lists 5, 8, and 4 sub-criteria respectively. Will each sub-criterion be weighted equally within its division, or will the Authority publish relative weights? Will the Authority publish the scoring rubric or evaluation sheet?

Sub-criteria will be weighted within their division. The Authority will not publish the scoring rubric or evaluation sheet. Qualified firms that advance to the competitive proposal phase will be notified separately.

54. Div. 5.A (pp.18-19) - Division 5.A requires "at least four (4) and no more than eight (8) completed projects by the General Contractor and the Principal Engineering Firm," with at least three attributable to the General Contractor and only three scored. (a) Is the 4-to-8 range the combined total for both firms? (b) How many of the Principal Engineering Firm's projects will be considered and scored? The RFQ specifies a limit

of three for the GC but is silent for the engineer. (c) Please confirm if these are scored separately from the 3 scored projects for the GC/Principal Engineer. If yes, do these projects carry the same weight in scoring as the 3 scored GC/Principal Engineer projects?

The four-to-eight project requirement is a combined total for the General Contractor and Principal Engineering Firm, with at least three projects attributable to the General Contractor. The Authority will consider and score up to three projects for each firm, consistent with the applicable evaluation criteria. These projects are not scored separately from the three projects identified for the General Contractor/Principal Engineer and will be evaluated in accordance with the established scoring criteria.

55. Div. 5 (p.17); Sec. 4.1.A (p.28) - Division 5 requires reference projects over \$5,000,000, while this Project is valued at \$50-60 million. Section 4.1 evaluates "Projects similar in size and scope." Will the Authority credit a \$6 million transit facility and a \$55 million non-transit facility equally, or will size comparability be scored on a graduated basis?

Projects exceeding the \$5 million minimum may be submitted; however, evaluation will consider the size, scope, complexity, and relevance of each project to the Project. Projects will not necessarily receive equal consideration solely because they meet the \$5 million minimum threshold.

56. Div. 5 (p.17) - Reference projects must be completed "within the past fifteen (15) years immediately before issuing this RFQ." (a) Confirm the look-back begins August 21, 2011. (b) For the General Contractor, does "completed" mean the date of substantial completion, the date the facility passed start-up/testing/commissioning, the recorded Notice of Completion, or final acceptance?

(a) Yes, confirming that August 21, 2011, is the correct look-back date.

(b) Final Acceptance

57. Div. 6 (p.21) - Division 6 on page 21 mentions roles including Project Manager, Principal Engineer, Lead Design Engineer, On-Site Project Manager, and Start-Up Manager. Then it goes on to define Key Personnel as only the Project Manager and the Principal Engineer. Please confirm the Key Personnel roles you want identified.

Key Personnel include: Project Manager (having overall responsibilities for design and construction), Principal Engineer (Engineer of Record, having primary responsibilities for Design Services under the Design-Build Contract), Lead Design Engineer, On-Site Project Manager, Construction Superintendent, and Start-Up Manager. The identified Key Personnel positions represent functional roles for the Project. These roles may be assigned to a single individual or multiple individuals based on the

Design-Builder's proposed organizational structure, provided each individual is appropriately qualified, experienced, and licensed, as applicable, to perform the assigned responsibilities. The Design-Builder remains responsible for ensuring that all required functions and responsibilities are adequately covered throughout the Project.

58. Div. 6 (p.21); Form K (p.69) - May one individual serve in two Key Personnel roles (for example, Project Manager and On-Site Project Manager, or Principal Engineer and Lead Design Engineer)? If so, must Form J reference projects be submitted for each role separately? Can we include roles and resumes in addition to those defined by the RFQ?

Yes. An individual may serve in two Key Personnel roles provided the individual meets the qualifications and experience requirements for each role. Form J reference projects may be used to demonstrate the individual's qualifications for both roles, provided the experience is applicable to each role. DB Entitys may identify additional personnel or roles; however, only the Key Personnel positions identified in the RFQ will be evaluated under the applicable Key Personnel criteria.

59. Sec. 4.1.C (p.29) - Financial Capability represents 20% of the total score and is evaluated on profitability and growth, solvency, financial efficiency, and ratings. Will the Authority publish the specific ratios and thresholds used? Will a firm with a strong balance sheet score materially higher than one that merely demonstrates adequate capacity for a \$60 million project?

The Authority will not publish specific financial ratios or scoring thresholds. Financial Capability will be evaluated based on the criteria identified in the RFQ, including profitability and growth, solvency, financial efficiency, and ratings. The Authority will consider the totality of the financial information submitted and the firm's demonstrated financial capacity to perform the Project. Scores will be based on the relative strength of the information provided in accordance with the established evaluation criteria.

60. Div. 7 (p.22); Sec. 2.4 (p.7) - Division 7 states financial information will be confidential and not subject to the Public Records Act. Should Division 7 be submitted in a separately sealed envelope within the submittal package? Should financial materials be marked "Trade Secret" per Section 2.4.B, and if so, does that marking conflict with the Authority's stated position that all submittals are non-public under PCC Section 20101(a)?

Division 7 does not need to be submitted in a separately sealed envelope. Financial information should be marked as confidential and will be treated as confidential in accordance with Section 2.4. "Confidential" or "Trade Secret" markings do not conflict with the Authority's treatment of Statements of Qualifications as non-public during the procurement process pursuant to PCC Section 20101(a).

61. Sec. 1.0 (p.3); Sec. 3.1 (p.24) - Section 3.1 references "drawings" showing quantity and location of non-revenue charging infrastructure. Sections 1.0 and 3.1 state the

Authority will provide the Project Manual with performance specifications. When will the Project Manual and referenced drawings be made available - at RFQ, or only to shortlisted firms with the RFP?

Project Manual and referenced drawings will be made available only to shortlisted firms at the competitive proposal stage.

62. Sec. 3.1 (p.24); Sec. 3.2 (p.24) - Section 3.1 identifies non-revenue EV charging, provisions for trailered/fixed hydrogen fueling, and a public hydrogen fueling facility as items that "may or may not be included in the base scope at the sole discretion of the Authority." Is the \$50-60 million budget inclusive or exclusive of these items? When will the Authority make the inclusion decision - before the RFP, during the RFP, or after award as an option? If after award, will they be priced as separately exercisable options?

The Authority will incorporate options into the project at the Authority's discretion as funding becomes available. Alternates/Betterments are intended to be priced out as separately exercisable options.

63. Sec. 3.5 (p.25); Sec. 3.6 (p.26) - Which agency will serve as the building permit authority for this project? What plan review durations should respondents assume for their schedules, and are those durations Authority-borne or Design-Builder-borne delay risk? Per Section 3.6, which specific governmental approvals will the Authority obtain?

This information is not necessary to complete the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at this step in the procurement process. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.

64. Sec. 3.1 (p.24) - Battery electric bus charging infrastructure with accommodation for future expansion typically requires substantial electrical service. What is the status of utility service planning, the committed service capacity, and the utility's projected timeline for the service upgrade? Is the utility interconnection schedule an Authority-furnished item or Design-Builder risk?

This information is not necessary to complete the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at this step in the procurement process. The Authority will provide the applicable Project information to eligible shortlisted firms during the next step of the process, in accordance with PCC § 22160.

65. Sec. 3.2 (pp.24-25) - Federal Buy America (49 CFR 661) and Build America, Buy America (2 CFR 184) requirements apply. How will these be applied to BEB charging equipment, switchgear, transformers, and construction materials? Will the Authority pursue waivers where domestic product is unavailable or where availability drives schedule risk, and who bears the cost and time impact of a waiver denial?

The Design-Builder is solely responsible for designing and constructing the Project in compliance with all applicable Federal Buy America and BABA requirements, including requirements applicable to charging equipment, switchgear,

transformers, and construction materials. The Design-Builder shall account for all compliance requirements, costs, and lead times in its proposal and schedule. Any waiver request shall be subject to applicable federal requirements and Authority approval. The Design-Builder assumes responsibility for resulting cost or schedule impacts attributable to its failure to comply or to obtain required waivers.

66. Sec. 3.2 (p.25) - The project is subject to 49 CFR Part 26, but Section 3.2 states no separate goal has been established for this procurement. Will a DBE contract goal be established at the RFP stage? Will DBE participation or a DBE program be evaluated in the RFQ scoring?

No separate DBE contract goal has been established for the RFQ or this procurement at this time. DBE requirements applicable to the Project will be identified in the RFP, if applicable. DBE participation is not a separate evaluation criterion in the RFQ scoring.

67. Sec. 4.0 (p.27) - Section 4.0 states the Authority "will require all subcontractors providing construction work exceeding \$250,000 to have had a prior working relationship with the prime contractor within the past 10 years." (a) Does this apply at the RFQ stage, or only at RFP and award? (b) How is a "prior working relationship" defined and documented - any prior contract of any value, or a threshold? (c) How does this reconcile with the Section 4.0 obligation to publicly notice unlisted subcontracted work and afford Public Contract Code Section 4100 et seq. protections, which anticipate open competition? (d) Does this requirement apply to design subconsultants?

(a) The requirement applies at the RFQ stage to the construction subcontractors identified in the Statement of Qualifications and will also apply during the RFP and project execution stages. (b) "Prior working relationship" means the subcontractor has previously performed work for the prime contractor within the past 10 years; no minimum contract value is established. DB Entitys shall identify the applicable prior project(s) upon request. (c) The requirement does not supersede applicable Public Contract Code Section 4100 et seq. requirements, including requirements governing subcontractor substitution and unlisted subcontracted work. (d) The requirement applies to construction subcontractors and does not apply to design subconsultants.

68. Sec. 2.17 (p.14) - Section 2.17 prohibits AECOM Technical Services, Inc. and WSP USA, Inc. (including parents and subsidiaries) from participating in any capacity. Does this prohibition extend to (a) lower-tier subconsultants and suppliers, and (b) individual employees who previously worked at either firm but are now employed by a respondent team member, including any who worked on this project's planning or design?

The prohibition in Section 2.17 applies to AECOM Technical Services, Inc. and WSP USA, Inc., including their parents and subsidiaries, participating in the procurement or Project in any capacity. It does not, by itself, prohibit lower-tier subconsultants,

suppliers, or individuals who were previously employed by either firm from participating through an otherwise eligible respondent, provided they are no longer employed by or affiliated with the excluded firm and their participation does not otherwise violate the RFQ or applicable conflict-of-interest requirements. Respondents remain responsible for identifying and addressing any actual or potential conflicts of interest.

69. Form A (p.31) - Form A requires the certification to be executed "in Yuba County, California." Most respondents will execute and notarize in their principal office county. Will the Authority accept execution and notarization in the signatory's county of business, provided the declaration is made under penalty of perjury under California law?

Yes.

70. Sec. 2.2 (p.6); Sec. 2.18 (p.14); Div. 5 (p.18); Div. 8 (p.23) - (a) Is there an overall page limit for the SOQ? (b) Do Forms A through K, resumes, org documents, financial statements, notarized declarations, and tab dividers count toward any page limit? (c) Is a minimum font size or margin specified? (d) Is double-sided printing acceptable, and does a sheet printed on both sides count as one page or two? (e) May 11" x 17" fold-out sheets be used for the Division 8 organizational charts, and how are they counted?

(a) There is no overall page limit for the SOQ. (b) No. (c) No minimum font size or margin is specified; however, submissions should be clear and legible. (d) Yes. (e) 11" x 17" sheets may be used for Division 8 organizational charts.

71. Sec. 2.2 (p.6) - Must the USB contain a single combined PDF of the entire submittal, or separate bookmarked PDFs per Division? Is a searchable/OCR'd PDF required?

A single PDF is allowed, but a separate PDF per division is preferred. Yes, searchable PDF documents are preferred as well.

72. Sec. 4.0 (p.27); Sec. 4.2 (p.29) - Sections 4.0 and 4.2 describe a documents-only evaluation. Does the Authority reserve the right to conduct interviews, presentations, or request clarifications from respondents before establishing the shortlist?

Yes.

73. Sec. 1.0 Schedule (p.4); Sec. 2.11 (p.12) - Authority responses are due September 18 and qualifications are due October 2 - a fourteen-day window. If responses result in material changes to the forms, scoring sheets, or scope, will the Authority extend the Qualifications Due Date?

No extension is anticipated at this time.

74. Form D, Item 2.E - Information about the Principal Engineer – this item states to provide information in “5c” for joint ventures or partnerships. We believe that “5c” should be changed to “E3”. Please confirm.

Yes, that is correct.

☐ Corporation – provide information in E1

☐ Sole proprietorship – provide information in E2

☐ Joint Venture, Partnership, or Other legal entity – provide information in E3

Form D has been modified.

75. Form G / Form I, G-10 to G-12 - There appears to be a discrepancy in the scoring for Questions G10, G11, and G12. Each of these questions addresses whether the Principal Engineer/firm has been convicted of a crime. The current scoring structure awards 10 points for a “Yes” response and 7 points for a “No” response. Please review Questions G10, G11, and G12 and confirm whether the current scoring is correct or whether the point values should be reversed.

The current scoring for questions G-10 to G-12 is minus (-10) points for a “Yes” response and plus (+7) points for a “No” response. Firms are not awarded points for a “Yes” response.

76. Form J - The RFQ states it will score up to two additional projects each, for up to two Other Design Firms. This reads as if a DBE that submits two Other Design Firms for a max of 4 projects will score higher than a DBE that only submits one Other Design Firm with max of 2 projects. Is this the intent?

No. The Authority does not intend to award additional points based solely on the number of Other Design Firms or reference Projects submitted. The requirement permits the DB Entity to identify up to two Other Design Firms, with one to two completed Projects for each identified firm, for evaluation under the applicable criteria. The Selection Committee will evaluate the relevance and quality of the submitted Projects; submitting additional firms or Projects does not, by itself, result in a higher score.

77. Form J - Form J does not include the option to identify which projects we want to be evaluated for scoring. Is there a preferred method for how we should identify these projects or should we just write it in on the top of the form?

You may write it at the top of the form.

78. Form J - Form J includes check boxes to attribute the project to the GC or Principal Engineer. When we submit form J for Other Design Firms, should we write in a check box for the Other Design Firm? For projects attributed to the GC, Principal Engineer, and Other Design Firm, can we check all the boxes?

Yes. For Other Design Firms, identify the applicable firm in the project attribution section. A Project may be attributed to the GC, Principal Engineer, and/or an Other Design Firm if each performed a substantive role on the Project. All checked boxes must accurately reflect the entity’s actual role.