

California High-Speed Rail Authority



Request for Qualifications for Track & Systems

RFQ HSR19-13

Offeror Q&As

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 1

No	Question	Authority Response
1	How do we register for the Track and Systems pre-bid conference on August 5? Is there a limit on the number of attendees per firm?	There is no pre-registration needed for the Industry Forum. There is no limit on the number of attendees per firm.

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 2 – REVISED August 16, 2019

No.	Question	Authority Response
2	<p>Prior to the August 5 Industry Forum /Conference are you able to share what the value of the Track and Systems Package is and its planned construction schedule?</p>	<p>The estimated value for the Delivery Period of NTP 1 is \$1.6 billion, as outlined in the RFQ Part A, Section 3.1.</p> <p>More information regarding the planned construction schedule will be available during the Request for Proposal (RFP) process.</p>
3	<p>Part A, Section 4.1 Procurement Schedule (Page 12 of 31):</p> <p>We request additional information regarding the format, agenda and resources available to Proposal Teams at the two events scheduled for August 5, 2019, located at 1500 Capital Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry Forum/Conference (9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.) • Small Business Informational Workshop (1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.) <p>For example, is the Authority leading these two events and are there scheduled presentations? Also, are these two events located in the same meeting space and is there space for Proposal Teams to setup booths, where they can discuss potential opportunities with SBEs attending the events? If the intent of either of these events is to provide space and allow Proposal Teams to meet SBEs and discuss potential opportunities, are there any resources provided by the Authority at the event for Proposal Teams (tables, power outlets, etc.)? The Authority previously indicated that no registration is required for the events, however, if there is an opportunity for Proposal Teams to setup space at these two events, what is the coordination process and who is the Authority contact for this process? If the Authority does not intend to allow Proposers a table to set up, can the Proposer provide pamphlets with team information and contact information to be handed out to interested SBE parties?</p>	<p>Agendas for the meeting and workshop are available at this link: www.hsr.ca.gov/communication/news_room/news_releases/?id=20</p> <p>The Authority is leading these events and will present information. Both the Industry Forum and Small Business Informational Workshop will be located in the same meeting space at the address identified in the link above.</p> <p>Attendees are encouraged to network, exchange contact information, and may distribute networking material. There will not be an opportunity for attendees to have tables or booths at the industry event during this RFQ process. However, there will be an opportunity during the RFP process to set up tables and booths.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
4	<p>Part A, Section 8.3.6, Part A. Background and Instructions Page 24 of 31</p> <p>Paragraph 8.3.6 indicates "All letters and forms shall be signed with wet signatures in ink. The wet signature letter and forms will be provided in the original sets with scanned PDF versions of the same in the written copy sets. Electronic signatures are not acceptable. Unless otherwise provided, all names and applicable titles should be typed or printed below the signatures."</p> <p>There is likely a significant amount of international Project references that would comprise responses to Forms H, I & J. Considering the longer response time associated with international Owner reference responses, we request that the Authority allow photocopies of the original to be accepted in the SOQ submission for forms I & J (in lieu of wet signatures). This would allow Project Owners to scan and email their completed forms and shorten the response time. Forms with wet signatures would be supplied within two weeks after the formal submission of the SOQ on September 5, 2019.</p>	<p>Photocopied signatures may be provided by the SOQ Deadline provided in Table 1 of the RFQ, provided that wet signatures follow within 10 working days of the SOQ Deadline. This will be clarified in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
5	<p>Part B, Section C.2, Part A, Part B. Qualifications Statement Page 3 of 29</p> <p>Please confirm that Form I: Project Owner References is only required for the Offeror and not also required for each Key Firm (even if a Form H is submitted for a Key Firm).</p>	<p>Per Part B, Volume 1, Section C of this RFQ, the Offeror “shall submit a Form I completed by the respective project owner for each project for which a Form H is submitted.” Since each Key Firm must appear on at least one Form H, each Key Firm must also appear on its corresponding Form I. While it is the ultimate responsibility of the Offeror to submit all required forms as part of the SOQ, this does not mean that Form I is only required for the Offeror.</p> <p>An addendum to the RFQ will be issued to provide the following clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Offerors” will be replaced with “The Offeror and each Key Firm” in the instructions to Form I (RFQ, Part B, Volume 1, Section C, Number 2). • “Offerors” will be replaced with “The Offeror and each Key Firm” in the first sentence in Form I. • In Form I, the field titled “Firm Name” will be replaced with “Firm Name(s)” to allow all the involved Offeror Team members identified in a Form H to also be identified in its corresponding Form I. • For Forms H and I, additional fields will be added for the Offeror to indicate what role(s) each involved Offeror Team member had on the project.

No.	Question	Authority Response
6	<p>Per Section C. Project Experience, please clarify that Key Firms are to provide 1-5 project references using Form H: Past Projects. Are Key Firms also to provide Form I: Project Owner References for every corresponding Form H: Past Project?</p> <p>Per Section D. Key Firms, are the 2 references using Form J: Key Firms References, to be for different projects and owners than those presented on Forms H and I?</p> <p>Also, if a single firm is fulfilling more than one Key Firm role, are they required to provide Forms H-J for each role?</p>	<p>Per the RFQ (Part B, Volume 1, Section C), each Key Firm must appear on at least one Form H and its corresponding Form I.</p> <p>For each Key Firm, the projects and references on its Form J's may be for the same projects and references as shown on Forms H and I.</p> <p>See also the answer to Question 5. The requirements for Form H and Form I will be clarified in a subsequent addendum.</p>
7	<p>The page limit in Part A Section 8.3 seems insufficient given the requirements in Part B. Would the Authority consider increasing the page limit?</p>	<p>The page limit provided in Part A, Section 8.3, of the RFQ will be increased in a subsequent addendum as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Technical Response shall not exceed 210 pages in length. • The Technical Response for the Delivery Period shall not exceed 100 pages. • The Technical Response for the Service Period shall not exceed 100 pages.

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 3

No	Question	Authority Response
8	<p>1. Part A, Section 4.1 Procurement Schedule:</p> <p>Since the RFQ was released, we have spent several days in thorough team reviews of: 1) the extensive amount of information being requested; 2) how much time it would take to compile that information; and 3) how many pages it would take to provide a responsive reply to the requirements. The amount of detail being requested is more typical to an RFP and highly unusual for an RFQ. We do not believe it is possible to either complete a compliant response to this RFQ before the current due date or within the page constraints. We kindly request an extension of one (1) month in order to complete the detailed requirements of the RFQ</p> <p>Should an extension not be permitted, we kindly request significantly reducing the requirements for the Sections listed below as many of these requirements could be moved to the RFP phase of the Track and Systems Procurement:</p> <p>Volume 3 - Section B - 1 Management Competence Delivery Period: 1.1.4 a-d, 1.1.5 b, 1.1.7 b, 1.1.7 c.a, c. e, 1.2.1. b, d, 1.2.2.a, 1.2.4 a, b, 1.2.6.a, c, d, 1.2.3 a</p> <p>Volume 3 - Section B - 2 Rail Infrastructure Management Delivery Period: 2.1.2 e, 2.2.3 c, 2.3.1</p> <p>Volume 3 - Section B - 4 Management Competence Service Period: 4.1.3 d, 4.1.7 c-g, 4.2.1 b, d, e, 4.2.2 b, 4.2.3 b</p> <p>Volume 3 - Section B - 5 Rail Infrastructure Management Service Period- 5.1.2, 5.2.1 b, 5.2.4 c, 5.3.2</p> <p>Volume 3 - Section B - 6 Technical Competence Service Period - 6.1.6 b, 6.1.7 b, d, 6.1.8</p>	<p>The SOQ due date is extended to Thursday, October 3, 2019. This change will be reflected in Table 1 of a subsequent addendum to this RFQ.</p>

No	Question	Authority Response
9	We ask for a submission date extension of 2 months to have enough time to build the consortium and prepare the qualification submittal.	See response to question 8 above.
10	<p>1. Form E: Past Performance Certification, Question #1: The definition of “affiliate” includes an Offeror’s “joint venture members”. It is not reasonable to require an Offeror to know the work history of every joint venture member with whom it has joint ventured. Please clarify the definition of “affiliate” to strike the word “members” and change the word “venture” to “ventures”.</p> <p>2. Form E: Past Performance Certification, Question #7: The Offeror is a large multinational engineering and construction entity performing billions of dollars of work for various governmental entities. The definition of “claim” could include any request for additional time or compensation or response to an agency where the agency disagrees or questions an element of the request. It is not commercially reasonable to expect an Offeror to track every such issue exceeding a \$100,000 for the past two years. Having an Offeror provide ten years of arbitration and litigation history, would provide the Authority with meaningful information on an Offeror’s claims history. Please revise the question to delete the portion seeking the two-year \$100,000 claims made information.</p>	<p>An addendum to the RFQ will be issued to provide the following clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the definition of “affiliate” in Form E: Past Performance Certification, Footnote 1, “joint venture members” will be replaced by “joint ventures.” • In Form E: Past Performance Certification, Question 7, “\$100,000” will be changed to “\$1,000,000.”
11	Requesting a 4 week extension due to the complexity of the team members, obtaining all the pertinent details for the technical volume, receiving the completed forms back from the project reference owners and the time of the year.	See response to question 8 above.

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 4

No.	Question	Authority Response
12	<p>Part C, Section 2, Part C. Exhibits, Page 5 of 10</p> <p>Section 2: List of Key Firms, provides a list of Disciplinary Leads that require an assignment of a Key Firm. Considering that the identified Lead Positions due not distinguish between construction, design and operation phases, some of the Proposer Lead Positions are not clearly defined. As an example, the Lead for Electrical and Mechanical Systems (Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning, pumps, distribution power) would be a prime designer during design, and multiple specialty subcontractors would be managed by a CJV during construction. In addition, there could be multiple leads within a discipline when interpreting the RFQ language defining deliverables and activities associated with the Lead Discipline Positions. For example, when considering only the design phase, the Lead Ancillary or Lead Rail Electrification could have multiple Engineers of Record for different scopes within these disciplines.</p> <p>Additionally, a Design-Build JV Team may present past experience of a similar, representative Project. Would the Authority consider the DBJV team qualified as a lead for one of the listed Key Firms, provided that the Project was considered successful and “similar in scope, size, or complexity as the Project to be constructed under this Contract.”?</p> <p>This portion of the RFQ could more easily be interpreted and responded to if “Lead” was changed to “Key Firm”, which could be left up to the Proposer to determine which “Key Firm” to highlight, where multiple Proposal Team members will perform scope within a discipline. Please either revise the requirements of Section 2 or clarify the intent.</p>	<p>Addendum 1 to the RFQ provides the following clarification in Part C, Exhibit A, Section 2:</p> <p>“The Offeror may identify more than one firm to fill each lead firm role, but each identified firm must be qualified for each role they are anticipated to fulfill. If more than one firm is identified for a lead firm role, the Offeror should make clear which functions within the lead firm role each identified firm is anticipated to fulfill, including, if applicable, in which phase of the Work the identified firm will fill the lead firm role.”</p> <p>Note also that the lead firm roles listed in Part C, Exhibit A, Section 2 are identified in the RFQ as a minimum requirement. Where Offerors identify additional functionalities necessary to complete the Work, they should identify other lead team members anticipated to perform these additional key functions.</p> <p>Offerors may list a joint venture as a Key Firm. Offerors may include for consideration a reference project by the joint venture similar in scope, size, or complexity as the Project to be constructed under this Contract, and such a past project may serve to qualify the joint venture as a Key Firm.</p> <p>Form C was clarified in Addendum 1 to this RFQ.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
13	Regarding Part A. Background and Instructions, Section 4.1 Procurement Schedule, page 12, we kindly request an extension of time to deliver the Statement of Qualifications (SOQ). In order to have enough time to submit properly the requested information, according the authorities demand, we would appreciate three months of additional time.	The SOQ due date was extended to Thursday, October 3, 2019. This change is reflected in Table 1 of Addendum 1 to this RFQ.
14	Will the deadline for questions be extended from August 9 to a later date? (Per 4.1, Procurement Schedule.)	The deadline for Offerors to submit questions has been extended to Friday, August 23, 2019. This change is reflected in Table 1 of Addendum 1 to this RFQ.
15	Where can I acquire a plan holders list for this solicitation?	The list of Industry Forum and Small Business Informational Workshop attendees is posted on the Authority's website at this link: www.hsr.ca.gov/business/contractors/track_and_systems.aspx
16	Could you please provide the different Forms in an editable (e.g. Word) file?	The Authority does not provide Word versions of procurement documents. Offerors can use software such as Adobe Acrobat Pro to create a fillable version after downloading the electronic version of the RFQ from the California State Contract Register website: www.caleprocure.ca.gov/event/2665/0000013569 .
17	According to the RFQ, an Equity Member or Key Firm can list project experience provided by a parent or sister company, as long as this parent or sister company serves as a Guarantor. Our interpretation is that is also applicable if the Guarantor is the parent company of the parent company of the Equity Member or Key Firm. Can you confirm that this interpretation is acceptable? (Part A. 9.1, page 26 of 31)	This is acceptable provided that the parent company of the parent company to the Equity Member or Key Firm is the Guarantor.
18	Given the importance of the subject (it is a pass/fail criteria), would you please provide further details about how the pass/fail assessment is going to be assessed (e.g. will each Equity Member/Guarantor be assessed or the overall team? What will be the score if one Equity Member/Guarantor has a Credit Rating, but the others not? What minimum ratios will provide the maximum score? It would help us to check in advance if there is any concern about being compliant and act accordingly. (Part A. 9.2.1, page 28 of 31)	Please refer to the definitions in Volume A of "Offeror", "Equity Member" and "Guarantor". As set out in the RFQ (Part A.9.2.1, page 28 of 31) the following will apply: "The Authority will evaluate the financial capability of the Offeror, Equity Members and Guarantors, if any, based on review of the financial information required by Part B, Volume 2 of the RFQ. Financial capability will be evaluated on the extent to which the financial metrics of the Offeror, Equity Members, and Guarantors, as applicable, demonstrate adequate financial capacity to deliver a project with the indicated contract value."

No.	Question	Authority Response
19	As per the RFQ, all the contract values have to be provided in USD. We anticipate many of the references will come from different countries? What exchange rate should we apply? (e.g. the construction completion date, or the submission date) (Form H)	Please use the construction commencement as a reference date and state the foreign exchange assumption used.
20	It is not very clear to us if a Key Firm role can be performed by a Joint Venture. We anticipate that some of the packages will be sizeable, and Joint Ventures could be performing them (e.g. Lead Trackwork Constructor). Would it be acceptable to add a second Key Firm performing the same role? (Definitions, page 3 of 31)	See response to Question 12 above.
21	As per the Form H instructions, this Form responses to Section B.1 of Part B, Volume 3. It is also referred this way at the Part A, section 9.2.9. But, it is further described in Part B, Section C.1, as part of Volume 1. We assume the latter reference is the correct one, is it so?	All copies of Form H are to be included in Volume 1 of the Offeror's SOQ, per Form A. The Offeror's SOQ should include its Technical Response in Volume 3 of its SOQ, per Form A. This may result in the same information provided in the Technical Response as well as in Form H.
22	The Project Owner Representative Contact Information to fulfill in Form H is the same person as Owner's representative to be completed in Form I?	Yes, the "Project Owner Representative" contact on Form H should be same as the "Owner's Representative" on corresponding Form I.
23	The Key Project Position Reference Contact Information to be fulfilled in Form J: does it refer to the same Owner's representative to be completed in Form I?	See response to Question 6 (Q&A Round 2).
24	Could you please explain the difference between Form I and Form J? (as far as we understand Form I should be signed by the project owner).	Each Key Firm should submit two Form J's, regardless of how many Form I's the Key Firm submits or appears on. See also the response to Question 6 (Q&A Round 2). The Project Reference Name on Form J may match, but is not required to match, the Project Owner Representative on Form I. Form I should be signed by the Project Owner's Representative.
25	Sub-section 11. in page 27 of 31 says that "each firm identified in a key firm position shall have two references"; are these two references the same showed in Forms G past projects? (Form J)	See response to Question 6 (Q&A Round 2).
26	I'm following up from the forum yesterday to confirm the list of attendees will be published at the following site or please clarify. https://hsr.ca.gov/business/contractors/track_and_systems.aspx	See response to Question 15 above.

No.	Question	Authority Response
27	Can you please send me the sign-in sheet from the mandatory job walk(s) and/or pre-bid meeting(s)?	See response to Question 15 above.
28	When will we post the list of attendees? How long are we accepting questions?	See responses to Questions 14 and 15 above.
29	<p>I just wanted to confirm that the only way for project information updates is to check the authority's website www.hsr.ca.gov/business/contractors/track_and_systems.aspx.</p> <p>And there are no e-mail notifications of information, updates, addendums, etc. that we can register for?</p>	<p>The California State Contract Register at www.caleprocure.ca.gov/event/2665/0000013569 is the official site for information and updates for this RFQ. See also Part A.4.3 of the RFQ which states:</p> <p>"Offerors are responsible for monitoring the State's Contract Register for information concerning this Procurement, and will be required to acknowledge in <u>Form A</u> that they have received and reviewed all materials posted thereon."</p>

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 5 – REVISED September 1, 2019

No.	Question	Authority Response
30	<p>1. Part B, Section 5.2.4C, Part B. Qualifications Statement Page 26 of 29</p> <p>It is not clear what comparison is requested in Part B, Section 5.2.4C: Provide a gap analysis, or a carry-over ratio, between the proposed high-speed rail system and operating a design proven track and systems project designed, built, and/or maintained by the Offeror.</p> <p>For example, is this paragraph requesting comparison of a past project (proposed vs actual) or is requesting a comparison to the proposed CA HSR system? Please provide additional clarification as to what information is being sought by the Authority in 5.2.4.C.</p>	<p>Part B, Volume 3, Section B.5.2.4.c will be removed in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ. The Authority anticipates that this item will be included in the RFP.</p>
31	<p>During the meeting, the Authority asked for a show of hands from companies who were interested in being the prime contractor for TS1. It would be helpful to small businesses like ours to have a list of those companies interested in the prime role. Could the Authority please ask for expressions of interest in being prime contractor and provide the list to this group?</p>	<p>The Authority does not require potential primes or JV partners to identify themselves to the Authority prior to the SOQ due date. Firms are encouraged to reach out directly to industry participants identified on the list of Industry Forum attendees at www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/programs/track/RFQ_HSR19-13_Attendees_List.pdf</p>
32	<p>I noticed my last name is not shown (entry 101) and would like to offer my last name and another minor correction to the name of the company if one so chooses to resend.</p> <p>Robert James The Allen Group, LLC</p>	<p>Thank you for the information. At this time the Authority does not anticipate making any changes to the list of Industry Forum Attendees.</p>
33	<p>When will the Authority's presentation at the event will be posted?</p>	<p>The presentation is posted at www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/programs/track/Track_and_systems_industry_forum.pdf</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
34	<p>Volume 3, Section B.1.1.6b, Qualifications Statement page 10 of 29</p> <p>1.1.6 Quality Assurance of Safety Critical Software Outline b. states “Provide evidence of compliance to ISO9001 and IEC1508, and particularly on high-speed rail systems EN50128;”</p> <p>Please clarify if the reference to IEC1508 is correct or if it should be IEC61508? IEC1508 was the original Draft and IEC61508 is the actual standard.</p>	<p>The reference should be to IEC61508 instead of IEC1508. This change will be reflected in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ.</p>
35	<p>Volume 3, Form E: Past Performance Certification, Form E: Past Performance Certification Page 11 of 15</p> <p>The Offeror requests for Form E, Question 11 and 12, that the Authority limit responses to the past 10 years.</p>	<p>An addendum to this RFQ will be issued to provide the following clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part C, Exhibit D, Form E, Questions 11 and 12 will seek the disclosure of relevant violations within the last 10 years.

No.	Question	Authority Response
36	<p>Volume 3, Part C Exhibits , Part C. Exhibits page 11 of 11</p> <p>Exhibit C: Firms Subject to Offeror Ex Parte Communications Prohibition during Solicitation, references firms that cannot be contacted regarding the California High-Speed Rail Track & Systems RFQ.</p> <p>Offeror teams may have Key Firms that have past Reference Project experience with Firms listed in Exhibit C. Strictly for the purpose of obtaining completed Project Forms H, I & J, please confirm it would be allowable for Key Firms of an Offeror to contact Firms listed within Exhibit C so that the forms can be forwarded to the Project Owner for completion.</p> <p>Additionally, Offerors or Key Firms may have past Reference Project Experience with the CA HSR Authority. Strictly for the purpose of obtaining completed Project Forms H, I & J, please confirm it would be allowable for Offerors or Key Firms of Offerors to contact another representative of the CA HSR Authority Representative in order to request completion of Forms H, I & J.</p>	<p>Offerors may contact the Authority, the firms identified in Part C, Exhibit C, or the entities listed in Part A, Section 5.1 of this RFQ for the purpose of completing Forms H, I & J, to the extent that such communications are necessary for the completion of said forms. Such communication shall be limited to past projects, references, and the logistics of completing and submitting the forms. It shall not include any other discussion related to this RFQ, the RFP, or the Procurement. (See Part A, Section 5.1 of this RFQ.)</p>
37	<p>Is it possible for an International Company, not currently established in the State of California, to submit this SOQ?</p>	<p>Yes. However, during the RFP stage prior to execution of the Contract, Proposers will be required to show that all team members are authorized to do business in the State of California.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
38	<p>If a Key Firm is a joint venture (ex. Firm A&FirmB) : how many projects of reference can be submitted by the Key firm (not more than 5?) and how many by each Firm A and B (not more than 5 each one)? (Section C. Project experience, page 3 of 29)</p>	<p>Part B, Volume 1, Section C of this RFQ states that each Key Firm shall submit a Form H for at least one, but not more than five, past project(s) referenced in the narrative in the Technical Response.</p> <p>An addendum to this RFQ will be issued to provide clarifications to Part B, Volume 1, Section C, Forms H and I. Some of the clarifications to the instructions for Form H in Part B, Volume 1, Section C, include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a Key Firm is a single entity, the past projects shall be submitted for that entity. • If a Key Firm is a joint venture that has worked together in the past, the past projects shall be submitted for the joint venture as a whole. However, if the joint venture has worked together on fewer than five projects in the past, each individual member may submit additional projects so long as no member appears on more than five past projects. • If a Key Firm is a joint venture that has not worked together in the past, at least one past project, and not more than five, shall be submitted for each prime member of the joint venture. • If more than one Person will fill a Key Firm role, as contemplated in the second paragraph of Part C, Exhibit A, Section 2, at least one past project shall be included for each Person. No more than five past projects shall be submitted for each Person performing that role.

No.	Question	Authority Response
39	<p>Considering that a KEY FIRM role will be performed by a joint venture (Firm A+Firm B). Would the Authority accept reference projects by the KEY FIRM implemented (carried out) by one of the joint venture firms (some of the reference projects by Firm A and some of the reference projects by Firm B)? (Section C. Project experience, page 3 of 29)</p>	<p>Section 9.1 of the RFQ states:</p> <p>“Unless otherwise specified, for project experience provided in the SOQ to be considered responsive, Offeror shall list only projects for which the corporate entity (company, joint venture, partnership or consortium) providing track or systems experience (design, system integration, construction, testing, Verification and Validation (V&V), certification, maintenance or construction) was:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Equity Member, Key Firm (or a role that is equivalent to a Key Firm) itself; 2. A controlled subsidiary of such Equity Member or Key Firm that had meaningful involvement in the Track and Systems contract performance; or, 3. A parent or sister company of the Equity Member or Key Firm, if such company serves as a Guarantor.” <p>Offerors that identify a joint venture as a Key Firm may submit past projects from individual members of the joint venture. Such past projects may serve to qualify the joint venture if the experience presented is, in sum, adequate to do so.</p> <p>See also the response to Question 38 above.</p>
40	<p>If a Key Firm is a joint venture (ex.FirmA&FirmB): does the Authority accept that the Project reference similar in scope and complexity to be submitted by the Key Firm had been carried out only by Firm A? (Section C. Project experience, page 3 of 29)</p>	<p>Each firm identified for a Key Firm role must be qualified for the role in which they are expected to fulfill. One joint venture member’s experience cannot be used to qualify the joint venture as a whole if another firm within the joint venture, which is not qualified for a specific role, is anticipated to perform that specific role.</p> <p>See also the response to Question 38 above.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
41	<p>Regarding the RFQ No. HSR19-13 Track & Systems, we would like to clarify the point 5.2.1 Organizational Conflicts of Interest for Track and Systems of the RFQ.</p> <p>Our question regarding this point would be:</p> <p>Could the successful Offeror be precluded from participating on future RDP / PMC contracts issued by the Authority? If the response is affirmative, would all of its subs be precluded too? Even if they opt to be a sub to a future RDP / PMC contractor?</p>	<p>The Authority does not have enough information at this time regarding future procurements to provide a definitive response and will review potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest on a case-by-case basis when appropriate.</p> <p>The Authority's Conflict of Interest Policy can be found at www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/about/doing_business/Organizational_Conflict_Interest_Policy_Final9152011.pdf</p> <p>An addendum to this RFQ will be issued to provide the following clarification to Part A, Section 5.2.1:</p> <p>"To the extent any future procurements for project and construction management services or design-build contractor services are for the <i>same</i> Project Section as any of the Track and Systems design, build, and maintain work, it is likely that the Track and Systems Contractor would be precluded from participating in such procurement based on an organizational conflict of interest (under Section VII) of the Authority's Organizational Conflict of Interest Policy. It is also likely, pursuant to Section VII of the Authority's Policy, that the Track and Systems Contractor would be conflicted out of a future Rail Delivery Partner/program management consultant procurement or equivalent. This serves as examples of potential future organizational conflicts and is not an exhaustive list."</p>
42	<p>I accidentally entered my personal email instead of my work email. Can you please change my email address [on entry row no. 74 for Teri Zink] from [...] to teri.zink@aecom.com.</p>	<p>See response to Question 32 above.</p>

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 6

No.	Question	Authority Response
43	Provide Clarity on the delineation of Operation responsibilities, field and control room, between Deutsche Ban and the O&M contractor? Can you provide a detailed scope of work or a copy of the O&M contract?	More information regarding the division of operations responsibilities will be available during the Request for Proposals (RFP) process.
44	Could the Authority please track changes in subsequent addendums to the RFQ?	Authority documents posted on the website are in compliance with Section 508 of the United States Workforce Rehabilitation Act. The Authority provides a change log on its website summarizing all changes in Addendums.
45	Can we have an extension of time to submit additional questions? We would like an additional three weeks to submit questions.	A one week extension for asking questions will be granted. The new deadline for asking questions regarding the RFQ will be Friday, August 30, 2019, at 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time. Answers to all questions will be posted by the Authority on Friday, September 6, 2019. All other dates will remain unchanged. This schedule revision will be included in a subsequent addendum.
46	Form I Project Owner Reference, once this form is completed, is the Project Owner expected to return this form to the Offer or directly to the Authority?	The Offeror is required to submit each completed Form I as part of its SOQ package.
47	We kindly request an extension of 4 months of the SOQ deadline	The Authority is currently unable to extend the SOQ deadline. The SOQ deadline was previously extended to October 3, 2019, in RFQ Addendum 1.

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 7

No.	Question	Authority Response
48	Our firm is an aggregate supplier throughout the Central Valley and was wondering where I could locate the type of track system being proposed. Specifically I'm trying to identify the ballast rock requirements.	It is anticipated that determination of trackform type will be by the Track & Systems Contractor, subject to certain constraints. More information will be provided in the RFP.
49	We are NOT pursuing the TS1 DBM opportunity. We are very interested on the Track and Systems Project and Construction Management Services. Is there any timeframe for the procurement process you can share with us?	The Authority anticipates releasing a procurement for construction management services for the Track and Systems contract in the first quarter of 2020.
50	<p>1. RFQ, Part A, Section 2.0 Definitions and Section 9.1 General Responsiveness:</p> <p>In Part A, 9.1, No.3, project experiences may be submitted from a corporate entity which includes a parent or sister company of the Equity Member or Key Firm, if such company serves as a Guarantor. In Part A, Definitions, the term Guarantor is defined as being applicable to Persons who will be in obligors "under any guarantee in favor of the Authority".</p> <p>Key Firms may not have a guarantee in favor of the Authority as they will be subcontractors to the Equity Members. We request that project experiences may be submitted for Key Firms where the corporate entities can include parent and sister companies of Equity Members or Key Firms (delete "if such company serves as the Guarantor").</p>	<p>The section will not be changed as requested. However, an addendum to this RFQ will be issued to provide the following clarification in Part A, Section 9.2.3:</p> <p>"A parent or sister company of the Equity Member, if such company serves as a Guarantor."</p>
51	The estimated value for the Delivery Perion of NTP 1 is \$1.6 billion, does this amount include the Service Period and the 30 year maintenance?	No, the Service Period will be paid through separate service payments. More information regarding the service payments will be available in the RFP.

No.	Question	Authority Response
52	Do all the firms have to submit a Guarantor? Or just the Offer and Equity firms?	<p>No, a Guarantor is not required for any firm. Offerors are required to demonstrate that they have the financial capability to deliver the Project successfully. To do so, Offerors <i>may</i> propose a Guarantor or Guarantors.</p> <p>For example, Part B, Volume 2, Section E of this RFQ, states: “<i>If</i> the Offeror or Equity Member of the Offeror Team does not have financial statements or cannot demonstrate the financial capability to complete the Project, then the affected member <i>may</i> propose a Guarantor that will provide a guarantee covering the performance and financial obligations of the affected entity if awarded the Contract.” (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>However, note that upon review of an Offeror’s financial capability “[t]he Authority may, in its discretion and based upon review of the information provided, specify that an acceptable Guarantor is required as a condition of shortlisting.”</p>
53	Upon completion of the evaluation of the SOQ packages received, will the authority publish or provide any scoring details to the short list of bidders? If so, what level of detail regarding scoring of the SOQ will be provided at that time?	The Authority will publish the shortlist, including a ranking of shortlisted firms, total scores, and scores for the six main technical scoring criteria. Additional scoring information, including scores for all scored items, may be provided to the Offerors, and may be published separately with the materials provided to the Authority’s Board of Directors and to the public prior to the release of the RFP.
54	Please could you clarify if in case of being an entity not formed yet; if this entity shall be formed for the presentation of the RFQ stage; or the presentation of the RFP stage or in case of being awarded the contract?	The Offeror must be a Person, as defined in Part A, Section 2.1 of this RFQ. A corporate entity (company, joint venture, partnership or consortium) created for the purpose of performing the Contract need not be formed at the time of the SOQ submittal. Additional information will be provided in the RFP stage.
55	Offeror inquiries Round 5, Question 37, page 3 of 6. It is stated that "during the RFP stage proposers will be required to show that all team members are	See revised response to question 37 (Q&A Round 5). Additional information will be provided in the Instructions to Proposers (ITP) as part of the RFP.

No.	Question	Authority Response
	authorized to do business in the state of California"; please could you clarify in case of being a propose from abroad the way of proving that a proposer is authorized to do business in the state of California (for example to be registered in the State of California to transact business in this State) and the steps to be taken for fulfilling this requirement? Please clarify, in case of being a subcontractor from abroad, if this requirement shall be also fulfilled during the RFP Stage.	
56	Related to the previous question, to be authorized to do business on the State of California is going to generate some cost and duties to the proposers; so, instead of fulfilling this requirement during the RFP stage, please could you consider postponing it in case of being awarded the contract?	See response to question 55 above and revised response to question 37 (Q&A Round 5).
57	RFQ NO: HSR19-13 , Volume 2 Financial Statements, Material Changes and Off-Balance Sheet Liabilities. Please could you clarify if in case of being a subcontractor, this information shall be also provided? In case of being a company not formed yet, please could you clarify if this information should be presented by each of the future members?	Please see Part A, Section 9.2.1 of the RFQ: "The Authority will evaluate the financial capability of the Offeror, Equity Members and Guarantors, if any, based on review of the financial information required by Part B, Volume 2 of the RFQ."
58	RFQ NO: HSR19-13, Volume 2 Financial Statements, Material Changes and Off-Balance Sheet Liabilities. Please could you clarify the number of years of financial information that should be provided?	Please see Part B, Volume 2, Sections A and C for number of years required. Section B will be revised to add "for the past three years" in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ.
59	In case of not having the audited financial statements in U.S. dollars, but in English; please could you clarify if in case of converting the financial statements in U.S. dollars, the conversion could be certified by the chief	In lieu of a certified public accountant, the CFO of the entity could certify the conversion. The prevailing foreign exchange rate (from a stated and verifiable source) at the date of the financial statement should be used for the conversion. This will

No.	Question	Authority Response
	<p>executive or chief financial officer? Please, could you specify the source and the date of the exchange rate to be used?</p>	<p>be reflected in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ in Part B, Volume 2, Section A.</p>
60	<p>RFQ NO: HSR19-13, Point 9.2.1 Financial Capability, page 28 of 31. Please could you clarify the different items of the financial statements to be used for obtaining the ratios stated on this point, and the financial metric that would be considered for them in order to obtain the maximum punctuation?</p>	<p>The Authority will use the information provided by the Offeror in its financial statements to calculate relevant financial metrics.</p>
61	<p>Related to the previous question, please could you clarify if the "Financial Capability" shall be determined by the Client using the financial information provided by the proposers or it shall be determined by the proposers by their own?</p>	<p>The Authority will use the information provided by the Offeror in its financial statements to calculate relevant financial metrics and determine financial capability.</p>
62	<p>Related to question 3 [Offeror Inquiry question 56], in case of an entity formed by various proposers, please clarify if financial capability shall be determined one by one, or by the Offeror, Joint Venture, Partnership... as a whole?</p>	<p>Please note as per Part A, Section 9.2.1. "The Authority will evaluate the financial capability of the Offeror, Equity Members and Guarantors, if any, based on review of the financial information required by Part B, Volume 2 of the RFQ. Financial capability will be evaluated on the extent to which the financial metrics of the Offeror, Equity Members, and Guarantors, as applicable, demonstrate adequate financial capacity to deliver a project with the indicated contract value."</p> <p>The Authority will determine a single score out of 60 for the Offeror, considering the above information where relevant.</p>
63	<p>Part A. Background and Instructions. & Part C. Exhibits. 2.1 Definitions. Subcontractor & Section 2: List of Key Firms. Please, confirm that the key firms that assume the role of Lead Train Control, Telecommunications</p>	<p>Key Firms must be Offerors or Equity Members or first-tier Subcontractors to an Offeror or Equity Member. This will be reflected in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ.</p> <p>The RFP will require Proposers that are joint ventures to submit a letter signed by each Equity Member indicating that it accepts joint and several liability for the Proposer's obligations under its</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
	Systems and Ancillary (including but not limited to SCADA and CCTV), will be accepted by the Authority to act as subcontractor of the Offeror. Please also kindly clarify what is the liability of the Key Firms with the Authority and confirm that no joint & several liability principle will apply among Key Firms and the Offeror.	Proposal and any resulting contract. The Authority does not anticipate requiring a first-tier subcontractor to have joint and several liability. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.
64	Part A. Background and Instructions. 9.1 General Responsiveness Please confirm that Key Firms: (i) shall not be mandatorily a member of the Offeror JV; and (ii) can be Subcontractors at any tier and do not necessarily have to be directly subcontracted by the Offeror	See response to question 63 above.
65	Part A. Background and Instructions 9.2.1 Financial Capability Please, provide the specific reference values of each Metrics corresponding to the maximum/minimum score	The Authority will not provide specific reference values. The Authority will determine the scores against each of the six Financial Capacity Criteria given in the table in Part A 9.2.1. Please note the Financial Metrics given in the table are examples of metrics and are not necessarily exhaustive of the metrics that may be referenced in the evaluation.
66	Part A. Background and Instructions 9.2.1 Financial Capability Please, confirm how the financial Capacity will be evaluated: i) each Equity Member separately ii) Equity members consolidated (as a 1 single person). If so, could you please provide the consolidation rules?	See response to question 62 above.
67	Part A. Background and Instructions. 9.3 Technical scoring	See Part A, Section 8.3 for format criteria.

No.	Question	Authority Response
	In order to homogenize the Offeror's deliverables, please, provide the template and number of pages expected by the authority for each technical deliverable	
68	Please, confirm that: i) the Expressions of Interest is not a mandatory requirement to submit SOQ. ii) a different legal entity, within the same group that submitted the EoI, could address the SoQ	Submission of an expression of interest is not mandatory to submit an SOQ. A firm's involvement, or a lack thereof, in the industry review process for the Authority's draft RFP for Track and Systems has no bearing on that firm's ability to participate in this Procurement.
69	Part B. Qualifications Statements. Section C. Project experience. 1 Form H: Past Projects We understand that it is accepted that the Offeror Team (Offeror Team as defined in article 2.1 Definitions) provides one (1) Format H that excess of \$500 million. Please, confirm our understanding.	The SOQ must contain a fully completed Form H, Past Projects, for each project identified in response to Part B, Volume 3, Section B.1. The SOQ must also contain a fully completed Form H, Past Projects, for each project identified in response to Part B, Volume 1, Section C.1, and identify past projects meeting all the requirements set forth therein. This will be reflected in Part A, Section 9.3.9 in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ. Note that Part B, Volume 1, Section C.1 has been modified in a previous addendum to this RFQ. Please see the requirements detailed in the most recent addendum.
70	Part B. Qualifications Statements. 3.1.7 Ancillary-Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA), CCTV, Tunnel Systems, Warning Systems Please, clarify CIS meaning	Customer Information Systems (CIS), which includes departure and arrival boards and platform information, and is also known as Passenger Information System (PIS). This will be reflected in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ.
71	Part B. Qualifications Statements. 6.1.5 Telecommunications System Please, clarify when the authority expects to start the 30 years maintenance: i) after the first Track&System NTP commissioning ii) after the last Track&System NTP commissioning	Additional information will be provided in the RFP.

No.	Question	Authority Response
	iii) 30 years maintenance after each NTP commissioning	
72	<p>Part C. Exhibits. Figure 1: NTP 1-3 Limits of Work Map</p> <p>According to the RFP draft version (Part_B-2-1_TS1_1-0-Limits_of_Work_Map-2019-0501), the limits are defined at TS1 (from San Francisco to Bakersfield). Since only NTP 1, 2 and 3 are indicated in the figure 1 of the referenced document, please confirm the limits of work of the Track and System contract.</p>	<p>The RFP will more clearly delineate the Project limits and scope of work. The Track and Systems work will be issued through multiple Notices to Proceed (NTP) within the geographic limits of the Silicon Valley to Central Valley segment. Each NTP will require separate Board approval prior to issuance of that NTP. Please refer to Addendum 4.</p> <p>Please also refer to Part A, Section 3.1: “In preparing their SOQs, Offerors are advised to carefully review and consider all Project information posted on the Authority’s website at www.hsr.ca.gov/.”</p>
73	<p>Exhibit D: Forms Form E</p> <p>“the firm or any affiliate”. Foot Note 1: The term “affiliate” includes the firm’s parent companies, its subsidiary companies, general partnerships, limited liability companies, joint venture members and/or business relationship in which the entity has more than a 15 percent financial interest</p> <p>The Form E includes a broad request of information regarding past performance in projects. This information becomes unmanageable if the firm belongs to a multinational group of companies. It highly unlikely that any claim, contract termination delay liquidated damages etc., asiren? out of thousands of contracts can be assessed accurately. On the other hand, the legal representative of a single firm cannot act or make these kind of declarations on behalf of the rest of companies of its Group.</p>	<p>The definition of affiliate on Form E was clarified in Addendum 1 of this RFQ. See response to question 10 (Q&A Round 3). See also response to question 35 (Q&A Round 5). No further changes to Form E are anticipated.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
	Therefore, we respectfully request the Authority to remove the requirement of gathering Form E information on firms' Affiliates (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 of Form E).	
74	<p>Form G: Overall Project small Business Goal Commitment Certification</p> <p>We understand that the requirement of 30%, as goal for the Small Business participation, applies to the overall Track and System project (under responsibility of the Offeror). We kindly ask to remove the requirement in which each Key Firm needs to submit this Form G, since the offeror or the Equity members are the only responsible to fulfill this requirement for the overall project.</p>	<p>Form G is not required from Key Firms unless they are the Offeror or an Equity Member.</p> <p>This will be reflected in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ in Part B, Volume 1, Section A.7 and Part C, Exhibit D, Form G.</p>
75	What is the program office's planned schedule for issuing the latest Rail Delivery Partners RFP or will it be made available for industry review?	<p>Per Part A.5.2.1 of the RFQ, it is likely, pursuant to Section VII of the Authority's Organizational Conflict of Interest Policy, that the Track and Systems Contractor would be conflicted out of a future Rail Delivery Partner/program management consultant procurement or equivalent. The Authority's Organizational Conflict of Interest Policy is posted on its website and contains information on seeking a conflicts determination. Such determinations are made on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The Rail Delivery Partner contract is currently set to expire June 2022. The Authority has not yet determined whether it will issue an industry draft of the RFQ for the anticipated Rail Delivery Partner re-procurement.</p>
76	would you consider granting another extension for an additional week or two to allow for a little more time to pull together the qualifications for submittal?	<p>The SOQ Deadline will be extended to Tuesday, October 8, 2019, by 12:00 p.m. Pacific Time.</p> <p>This will be reflected in a subsequent addendum to this RFQ.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
77	The 6.1.2 Overhead Contact system is identified in the Service Period and not included in the Delivery Period. Did the Authority intend to exclude this from the Delivery Period?	An addendum will be issued to delete Part B, Section B, Item 6.1.2. Evaluation of the Overhead Contact System will be included as a part of Rail Electrification Part B, Section B, Items 3.1 and 6.1.
78	If the Offerer is a Joint Venture, does the JV have to be an incorporated legal entity prior to submittal of the SOQ?	See response to question 54 above.
79	Table 1 lists the SOQ deadline as October 3, 2019. We are requesting the Authority to kindly extend the SOQ deadline by at least one month to November 1, 2019, to provide sufficient time to constitute our team and prepare and submit an SOQ.	See response to question 76 above.

Track & Systems RFQ Offeror Inquiries – Round 8

No.	Question	Authority Response
80	<p>RFQ NO: HSR19-13, Volume 1, Section B. Surety Letter, page 3 of 30.</p> <p>Please could you clarify if the letter required, instead of being provided by a Surety or an Insurance company, could be provided by a Bank? In case of an Offeror not formed yet integrated by various members; please could you clarify if this letter should be issued by each member, or how to proceed in this case?</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Volume 1, Section B of the RFQ: “Evidence, provided in the form of a letter, from a surety or an insurance company shall indicate that the Offeror is capable of obtaining a performance bond and a payment bond for the Project.”</p> <p>The letter may be provided by a bank, provided that the bank issues similar performance and payment bonds to those required for the Project.</p> <p>In the case of an Offeror not yet formed, the letter should refer to the capability of a proposed Equity Member to obtain the necessary bonds.</p>
81	<p>Part B. Qualifications Statements. 3.1.4 Signaling/Automatic Train Control</p> <p>Please:</p> <p>i) describe how the Technical Approach need to be provided</p> <p>ii) confirm that "12 trains per-hour per direction at design speeds of up to 250mph" are not mandatory requirements to fulfil format H "Past Projects" either format J "Key Firms References"</p>	<p>i) Responses shall be consistent with the requirements in Part A, Section 8.3 and Part B, Volume 3, Section B.</p> <p>ii) “Previous evidence of experience in designing and building signaling systems for high-speed railroads” provided in response to Part B, Volume 3, Section B, Item 3.1.4 does not need to meet 12 trains per-hour per direction at design speeds of up to 250mph. “The Offeror shall provide its technical approach to...designing and building a signaling system capable of controlling 12 trains per-hour per direction at design speeds of up to 250mph.”</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
82	<p>Form J: Key Firms References & Form H: Past Projects</p> <p>Within the Form J it is stated that "Each identified in a Key Firm position must have two references"</p> <p>Within the Form H it is stated that "Provide the following information for each of the reference projects identified in response to Section B.1 of Part B, Volume 3"</p> <p>Please, clarify if the Key Firms that are not part of the Offeror have to provide Form H, or if only Form J is accepted.</p>	<p>See response to Question 6 (Q&A Round 2-REVISED).</p>
83	<p>"Part C, Exhibit A, Section 2: List of Key Firms, includes a Lead Operations Control Center, Lead Railway Operations, Lead Railway Operations Safety During Construction and Testing, and Lead System Integrator, among others.</p> <p>Please confirm that a High Speed Railway Operator acting as Key Firm for one or more of the above mentioned roles can take part in any RFQ or RFP launched by the Authority for the Rail Operations of the Revenue Services of the California High Speed Rail System."</p>	<p>The Authority does not have enough information at this time regarding future procurements to provide a definitive response and will review potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest on a case-by-case basis when appropriate. The Authority's Conflict of Interest Policy can be found at: https://hsr.ca.gov/business/general/organizational_conflict.aspx</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
84	<p>On page 31, RFQ Section 9.4, SOQ Evaluation Procedure, CA HSR Authority states that it will determine Offerors who, in their SOQ submittal, can provide the strongest opportunity for successful delivery of the Project; and that it will, therefore, make the final determination of the Offerors to be shortlisted; including that CA HSR Authority anticipates approximately shortlisting the top three scoring Offerors to receive invitation to participate in the subsequent RFP.</p> <p>[We] would like to know if CA HSR Authority will consider publishing the names of the shortlisted firms/primes prior to release of the RFP for the purpose of small businesses getting on teams?</p>	<p>The Authority will publish the shortlist prior to the release of the RFP and, subsequently, will publish contact information from the shortlisted teams for those who wish to contact them for small business opportunities.</p>
85	<p>Regarding the RFQ and anticipated RFP, will CA HSR Authority further clarify the requirements for small business participation throughout the lifecycle of the project; i.e., will these requirements be specified in an amended RFQ or in the anticipated RFP?</p>	<p>Additional information regarding Small Business participation requirements will be available during the RFP process.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
86	<p>Track and Systems Contract Term Sheet Industry Draft 5/9/2019, Pages 14 to 15.</p> <p>The document states the following insurance requirements:</p> <p>Contractor is required to provide the following insurance during the Construction Periods of the Contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Automobile Liability Insurance. The minimum combined single limit for primary coverage is [\$1,000,000] per occurrence. 2. Workers' Compensation and Employer's Liability Insurance at statutory limits, including not less than [\$1,000,000] for each accident. 3. Commercial General Liability Insurance. Annual limit of not less than [\$2,000,000] per occurrence, [\$4,000,000] aggregate and [\$4,000,000] products and completed operations aggregate. 4. Excess/Umbrella Liability Insurance of not less than [\$200,000,000] per occurrence and in the aggregate in excess of the above underlying coverages. 5. Professional Liability Insurance with limits of not less than [\$50,000,000] per claim and in the aggregate. 6. Railroad protective liability coverage, with a limit of not less than [\$25,000,000] per occurrence and [\$25,000,000] in the aggregate. <p>These requirements are directed to construction companies because of the high limits and special coverages like Railroad protective liability. Are there insurance requirements for engineering companies or subcontractors?</p>	<p>Offerors should anticipate that the RFP will contain insurance requirements applicable to professional service firms, as well as insurance requirements applicable to subcontractors. More information regarding these insurance requirements will be included in the RFP.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
87	Part C, Exhibit D. If we are using a single Form H to show relevant experience for multiple Key Firms, does a Form I need to be submitted for each Project Owner Contact Information provided? For example, Firm A may list John Doe as their Owner reference, but Firm B may list Jane Smith. Would “John” and “Jane” each need to complete and submit a Form I.	Yes, a separate Form I should be submitted for each Project Owner Representative identified on a Form H.
88	Part C, Exhibit D, Form J. Form J Projects submitted, is the Offerer able to provide examples on the writeup on these projects without submitting a Form H?	<p>Projects mentioned on Form J are not required to be included in Form H, however Form H shall be submitted for each project used as a case study in response to the requirements in Part B, Volume 3. Refer to Part A, Section 9.2.9 and Part B, Volume 1, Section C.1</p> <p>See also response to Question 6 (Q&A Round 2-REVISED).</p>
89	Part C, Exhibit D. Can the Offeror change the formatting for the Forms as long as the content requested remains the same?	Offers can resize boxes and/or add pages as necessary to provide the required information. Offers shall not otherwise change the formatting of the Forms.

No.	Question	Authority Response
90	<p>Part C Exhibits D.</p> <p>The Authority's answer to question #36 was: "Offerors may contact the Authority, the firms identified in Part C, Exhibit C, or the entities listed in Part A, Section 5.1 of this RFQ for the purpose of completing Forms H, I & J, to the extent that such communications are necessary for the completion of said forms. Such communication shall be limited to past projects, references, and the logistics of completing and submitting the forms. It shall not include any other discussion related to this RFQ, the RFP, or the Procurement. (See Part A, Section 5.1 of this RFQ.)".</p> <p>Please clarify that reference to "past projects", is not intended to preclude ongoing projects for which a firm may be seeking reference for Forms H, I & J.</p>	<p>Past projects may include ongoing projects for which a firm is seeking reference for Forms H, I, and J.</p>
91	<p>Part C, Exhibit D, Form H , Form H Past Projects Page 7 of 9</p> <p>Form H asks "Was this a federally funded Project?" Where the RFQ refers to federally funded, is federally funded intended to strictly refer to funded by the U.S Federal Government?</p>	<p>Yes, this refers to projects funded by the U.S. Federal Government.</p>
92	<p>RFQ HSR19-13 Track and Systems Addendum 2, Volume 3, Part C, Exhibits, Section 2: List of Key Firms, page 5 of 11.</p> <p>Please clarify the criteria for the Key Firm listed as Lead Train Control.</p>	<p>Refer to definition of "Key Firm" in Part A, Section 2.1. "Train control" is briefly referenced in several areas of the RFQ.</p> <p>Relevant information can be found in Part B, Volume 3, Section B, Items 3.1.4 and 6.1.3</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
93	<p>RFQ HSR19-13 Track and Systems Addendum 2, Volume 3, Part C, Exhibits, Section 2: List of Key Firms, page 5 of 11.</p> <p>Please clarify if the Key Firm listed as Lead Train Control must also be the System Supplier.</p>	<p>The Lead Train Control does not need to be the system supplier.</p>
94	<p>RFQ HSR19-13 Track and Systems Addendum 2, Volume 3, Part C, Exhibits, Section 2: List of Key Firms, page 5 of 11.</p> <p>Please clarify if the System Supplier for the Train Control must be a Key Firm and listed as Lead Train Control.</p>	<p>The system supplier does not need to be listed as Lead Train Control. Refer to Part C, Exhibit A, Section 2: “The Offeror should identify other lead team members anticipated to perform key functions in addition to these required firm team members.”</p>
95	<p>Part B-1: Functional and Technical Requirements Section 19 Interface Requirements 19.1 Electromagnetic Compatibility Page 129</p> <p>Will the new HSR trains be equipped to operate to San Francisco over the planned Caltrain electrified line, and is there a requirement to interoperate with their train control and communications network, without requiring changes?</p>	<p>This question refers to the Industry Draft Request for Proposals. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
96	<p>On page 5, RFQ Section 2, List of Key Firms, CA HSR Authority states that Offerors should list additional functionalities identified as necessary to complete the Work, with the listed Key Firms/ Lead Functions serving as a required minimum.</p> <p>[We] would like to know if: 1) CA HSR Authority would consider renaming the below-noted key functions to what we believe are more commonly used in industry terminology and to clarify understanding of the required functions as currently listed in the RFQ; and if 2) CA HSR Authority would consider adding the below-noted additional lead functions to be performed by a Key Firm; i.e., Recommended Renaming: A. Lead Ancillary: Change to Lead Communications Systems B. Lead Overhead Contact System: Change to Lead Overhead Contact and related Support Systems C. Lead Rail Electrification: Change to Lead Traction Power</p> <p>Recommended Additions: A. Lead Software Development B. Lead Vehicle Integration C. Lead Quality Assurance/Quality Control D. Lead Signaling E. Lead Project Controls F. Lead Risk Manager</p>	<p>The Authority is declining to re-name the Key Firms or lead firm roles at this time. Refer to Part C, Exhibit A, Section 2: “The Offeror should identify other lead team members anticipated to perform key functions in addition to these required firm team members.”</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
97	Are Construction Package 2-3 (CP 2-3) and CP-4 on schedule, and if there are delays, how does the program office plan to control and mitigate the impacts to Track and Systems?	Additional information will be provided in the RFP regarding the Track & System Contractor's access to the civil infrastructure.
98	If there are more than 119 miles needed for track spurs, will there be a dollar-per-mile metric for each additional mile?	The 119 miles are route miles for NTP 1. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.
99	Construction Packages 1, 2-3, and 4 mention the description of the work and the primes but not a preliminary construction schedule. Is there a draft or preliminary construction schedule available for review, and what assumptions were used in its development?	See response to Question 97 above.
100	Can the program office's risk register and, in particular, risk items for which assumptions are made be provided for our review?	The Authority does not anticipate providing a risk register.
101	What are the program office's plans to enable or support trains other than high-speed trains operating on the railway network, e.g. regional commuter rail feeder operators?	All trains operated on the high-speed network will be FRA TIER III-compliant.
102	Are any Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) waivers being advanced to enable and gain acceptance for the use of off-the-shelf, proven, foreign high-speed rolling stock mixed with FRA and Code of Federal Regulations conforming stock?	No FRA waivers are being advanced at this time.
103	Has the Authority identified where the maintenance facilities will be located?	Additional information will be provided in the RFP.

No.	Question	Authority Response
104	<p>As per Part A of RFQ NO: HSR19-13 Part A.9.2 No. 13, the Offeror or Offeror Team shall be capable of obtaining a payment bond in the amount equal to the contract value, and a performance bond equal to 50% of the contract value from a surety with A.M. Best's Rating Service classification of "A-VI" or better as evidenced by a Surety Letter (Part B, Volume 1, Section B).</p> <p>As per Section B, "The letter must include a specific statement that the surety/insurance company has reviewed this RFQ and evaluated the Offeror or Offeror Team's backlog, work-in-progress and financial condition including any proposed or anticipated changes in financial condition disclosed in response to Section B of Part B, Volume 2 in determining the Offeror's or Offeror Team's bonding capacity for NTP 1."</p> <p>Considering the magnitude of the project and its early stage of pre-qualification, Offeror is asking the Authority if, instead of providing this statement from a surety / insurance company, it is sufficient to provide a statement from its ultimate parent company that the Offeror will be equipped to provide the contract securities as agreed in the contract in the event of an award.</p>	<p>No, it is not sufficient to provide a statement from the Offerors ultimate parent company to meet this requirement. The Authority requires an independent assessment of the Offeror's capability to provide the required sureties.</p>

No.	Question	Authority Response
105	In the request for prequalification the Authority requests an outline schedule (section 1.2.1) however the draft of the General Provisions indicates within Schedule 3 that the Project Milestone are under development. Could the Authority issue a draft schedule 3 to assist in the preparation of a draft schedule.	Additional information will be provided in the RFP.
106	What mitigations are planned to make certain the Small Business goal of 30 percent is met? Other companies have fallen short of this required percentage of work completion, per the Best Practices of 49 C.F.R. Part 26, Executive Order (EO) S-02-06, in the past.	See response to Question 85 above.