



179 Cross Street, Suite A  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401  
(805) 781-4472 Fax (805) 781-1291  
[www.slorta.org](http://www.slorta.org)

Addendum #1: Clarifications on RFP  
**Design & Engineering Services for Improvements to RTA Transit Center**  
April 9, 2018

The Brooks Act establishes the procurement process by which architects and engineers are selected for design contracts with federal design and construction agencies – including grantees such as the RTA. It establishes a qualifications-based selection process, in which A/E contracts are negotiated on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualification for the type of professional services required at a fair and reasonable price. Price quotations are not a consideration in the selection process.

Unfortunately, the RTA used a “template” for the April 4<sup>th</sup> RFP document, and staff neglected to fully remove the cost proposal consideration language from the base RFP document. As such, this addendum is intended to amend the RFP document to remove all references to “cost proposal” in the vendor selection process. Specifically, the following changes are herein changed in the base RFP document (deleted language is ~~blue-lined/crossed-out~~, while new language is red-lined/underlined):

1. Table of Contents – remove “~~Attachment A – Cost Proposal~~”
2. Page 15, Section A. General Instruction, subsection 5 should read “RTA reserves the right to begin contract negotiations with a firm ~~award a contract to a firm~~ solely on the basis of the initial proposal submitted.”
3. Page 20, Section C. Project Approach, subsection 5 should be eliminated as follows: “~~Allocation of cost by task.~~”
4. Page 20, last set of numbered items should eliminate reference to a Cost Proposal as follows: “~~Attachment A: Cost Proposal (signed and placed in a separate envelope)~~”
5. Page 22, Section F. Cost Proposal – this entire paragraph should be entirely eliminated.

The Regional Transit Authority is a Joint Powers Agency serving residents and visitors of:

Arroyo Grande Atascadero Grover Beach Morro Bay Paso Robles Pismo Beach San Luis Obispo and The County of San Luis Obispo

6. Page 23, Section C. Evaluation Criteria, first paragraph should be amended to read:

The RTA intends to use a Best Value method to determine which firm's abilities is most advantageous to meeting the agency's goals for this project as determined by a Design Team Selection Committee. The selection of the Contractor will be qualification-based in accordance with the Brooks Act. Under this procedure, a vendor submits only a technical submittal outlining its qualifications and experience applicable to this solicitation. The vendor does not provide cost data. Following the technical evaluation process, the RTA will select the highest ranked Contractor for contract negotiations.

For work for which hourly billing is appropriate, the RTA and the Contractor will negotiate rates before the contract is executed. The Contractor will be required to submit its audited overhead rate. Following contract execution, the RTA and the Contractor will negotiate a final scope of work and a fee for each task order. For any task order for which an agreeable scope and fee cannot be reached, the RTA will accomplish each task by other means.

~~RTA intends to use a Best Value method to determine which proposal is most advantageous to the agency's goals. Technical and financial merit will be evaluated simultaneously by separate panels, which may consist of the same personnel. The panels' scores will be combined on the following criteria, noting that scores may be fractions and that ratings will be scaled so that the best proposal in each element will receive the maximum points for that element.~~

7. The table of page 24 shall be replaced with:

Criteria	As Demonstrated By:	Weight of Criteria
Merit of Proposal/Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal, thoroughness and approach</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of project and requirements</li> </ul>	35
Firm Qualifications and Expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff qualifications</li> <li>• Adequacy of staff to perform the work</li> </ul>	30
Record of Past Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References</li> <li>• Ability to work effectively with RTA, other public agencies and the public</li> <li>• Demonstrated ability to complete work tasks within project timelines and project budgets</li> </ul>	<del>25</del> <u>35</u>
<del>Fees</del>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Reasonableness of costs</del></li> </ul>	<del>10</del>

8. Page 26 – eliminate the following: “~~\_\_\_\_\_ Cost Proposal (Attachment A)~~”

9. Page 27 should be eliminated, although it is expected this cost proposal format will be used by the highest-ranked vendor as part of the negotiations process.

Other Changes to RFP document:

1. Page 11 is a bad page break, and shall remain blank.
2. Page 20, last paragraph should read “... The following documents do not count toward the ~~15-page~~ 20-page maximum...”