

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
FOR
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

**LISTED BELOW ARE THE QUESTIONS (Q) SUBMITTED BY
POTENTIAL BIDDERS FOR THE**

**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE ADAPTATION AND
RESILIENCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PROJECT)**

**COUNTY PROJECT NO. RW528
PROJECT FILE NO. E5121**

**THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
HAS PROVIDED RESPONSES (R) TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW**

- Q1. What format is preferred for a Contract Exceptions Request? Would it be acceptable to send a Word document with proposed contract exceptions as an email attachment, or do the exceptions need to be submitted through the Questions section on OpenGov?
- R1. Please submit Contract Exception Requests through OpenGov. The County may consider Contract Exception Requests and reserves the right to reject requested modifications to its standard terms.*
- Q2. Can you confirm no pricing proposal is required? If it is required, can you confirm the format should match the table in the RFP that shows total amounts by task?
- R2. Pricing proposal should match the table provided in the RFP and submitted via OpenGov. Detailed task labor hours can be submitted as a separate attachment in OpenGov.*
- Q3. Given the short timeframe between question response deadline and proposal due date, would you consider granting a 2-week extension?
- R3. The deadline has been extended to March 13, 2026 by 4pm. The County will not consider extending the deadline further.*
- Q4. I wanted to respectfully ask whether the County might consider a modest extension to the March 4 deadline.
- R4. Please refer to response R3.*
- Q5. Can the "3.2. Statement of Minimum Qualifications," "3.3. Project Approach," and "3.4. Scope of Work Tasks/Milestones/Work Plan" sections in the eProcurement system be submitted as a PDF, or must they be entered directly into the text boxes? The system currently does not allow file uploads for these sections.
- R5. Please enter responses directly into OpenGov. PDF submissions will not be considered.*

- Q6. In the Technical Proposal section of the RFP, Section 4.3.8 (References) states: "Provide three (3) references for each of the following, including the name, address, and telephone number of recent clients (preferably other public agencies)." However, no categories or items are listed after "each of the following." Please clarify what reference categories are being requested.
- R6. Please provide three (3) business references for which you have provided similar services.*
- Q7. Can you please confirm the start and end dates to perform the plan?
- R7. Based on the timeline, contract award will be in May 2026, consultant is expected to start on the plan in May 2026 and continue until completion.*
- Q8. Is the Consultant expected to perform new GIS-based vulnerability mapping, or will County provide GIS data layers and analysis tools?
- R8. Consultants may use County-provided base maps to start, thereafter Consultants shall perform new analysis.*
- Q9. Are there specific climate scenarios (e.g., OPC 2018 guidance, Cal-Adapt projections) that must be used?
- R9. These examples are one of the guidelines Consultants may use. There are no restrictions on specific guidelines that Consultants must use.*
- Q10. For the 3-7 projects to advance to 30% design, will the County select the final projects, or will the Consultant recommend and finalize selection for Task 5?
- R10. The 3-7 projects for 30% design will be selected by the County based on consultant recommendations from Task 4.*
- Q11. What level of engineering detail is expected at 30% (e.g., plan-view only, cross-sections, drainage concepts, utility conflicts, preliminary geotechnical assumptions) for Task 5?
- R11. 30% conceptual design should include at a minimum: plan drawings, cross sections, drainage, traffic, utility, and environmental impacts.*
- Q12. Should environmental constraints (e.g., CEQA pathway, coastal permitting considerations) be identified at a screening level for Task 5?
- R12. Yes, environmental constraints and other considerations shall be included as part of Task 5 Scope.*
- Q13. Are right-of-way impact exhibits required, or narrative identification only for Task 5?
- R13. Exhibits to properly identify right of way impacts should be included.*
- Q14. Does the County anticipate structural, geotechnical, or hydrologic analysis at Task 5?
- R14. Above-mentioned analyses will be required based on improvements on the 30% conceptual design.*

- Q15. Is there an anticipated number of public workshops, stakeholder meetings, and pop-up events?
R15. Anticipate a minimum of two (2) public workshops, minimum of two (2) stakeholder meetings, and minimum of two (2) pop up events.
- Q16. Does the County expect the vendor to provide venue space, interpretation services, or translation of materials?
R16. Venue can be coordinated with the County. Interpretation and translation services (Spanish) are included in the Consultant scope of work.
- Q17. Is there a target participation threshold or engagement performance metric?
R17. Public engagement scope shall include development of a strategy, which will address the above items.
- Q18. Are stipends or community-based organization contracts anticipated for participation support?
R18. Stipends or community-based organization contracts are not anticipated for participation support.
- Q19. Approximately how many Advisory Committee members are anticipated?
R19. The Advisory Committee members will include key stakeholders listed in Task 6.
- Q20. Does the County expect in-person, virtual, or hybrid meetings?
R20. At a minimum, the meetings shall be in person. However, the exact method will be determined once the project is commenced.
- Q21. Are quarterly meetings the minimum or fixed number (i.e., eight meetings over two years)?
R21. Quarterly meetings with the Advisory Committee are the minimum.
- Q22. Is formal approval by the Advisory Committee required before advancing deliverables, or advisory concurrence?
R22. Yes.
- Q23. Does the County anticipate Technical Advisory Committee meetings separate from the broader Advisory Committee?
R23. No, they should be included in the broader Advisory Committee meetings.
- Q24. Given the required completion by June 30, 2027, does the County anticipate phased deliverable deadlines? Is there flexibility in sequencing tasks (e.g., overlapping engagement and prioritization)?
R24. Yes, schedule can be discussed after project award.
- Q25. Will the County provide GIS base layers, asset inventories, traffic data, evacuation route mapping, and prior climate modeling outputs?
R25. The Consultant will be responsible for developing and/or obtaining all necessary GIS layers, asset inventories, traffic data, evacuation route mapping, and climate modeling outputs required to complete the scope of work.

- Q26. Are specific software platforms required (e.g., ArcGIS Pro, Hazus, or County-hosted systems)?
R26. The County recommends ArcGIS and AutoCAD as drafting software.
- Q27. Is the Consultant expected to deliver editable GIS geodatabases in addition to CAD and Excel deliverables?
R27. Yes, if ArcGIS is used, the County will require File Geodatabase (.gdb) as part of the deliverables.
- Q28. Is there an estimated budget range for this project?
R28. Consultants should propose a scope and fee that are appropriate, efficient, and aligned with the anticipated level of effort.
- Q29. Is funding fully secured for the entire two-year base term?
R29. Yes. Consultants should propose a scope and fee that are appropriate, efficient, and aligned with the anticipated level of effort.
- Q30. If the County exercises the optional extension (up to five years), would additional scope or funding be anticipated?
R30. No. Consultants should propose a scope and fee that are appropriate, efficient, and aligned with the anticipated level of effort.
- Q31. "Can the County clarify the relative weighting of: Technical approach, Team qualifications, Pricing, and Local preference factors?"
R31. All the above will be considered in Consultant selection.
- Q32. Will interviews be scored as part of final selection?
R32. Interviews are not required in the selection process.
- Q33. Is price evaluated independently or integrated into best-value scoring?
R33. Price is evaluated independently of technical scoring.
- Q34. May all resumes be included in an appendix?
R34. Yes.
- Q35. RFP Section 4.3.8 (p. 18) states: "Provide three (3) references for each of the following, including the name, address, and telephone number of recent clients (preferably other public agencies)." Please clarify what is meant by "each of the following."
R35. See response R6.
- Q36. Would the County be willing to share the estimated budget set aside for this work?
R36. Please refer to response R28.
- Q37. Would the County consider providing a two week extension to ensure any impacts from answers to questions be incorporated into the various individual documents required for upload/submittal.
R37. Please refer to response R3.

- Q38. Would it be allowable to provide proposed contract exceptions and requested changes via track changes in the Standard Contract Template Word document. If yes, should this be emailed directly to the Procurement Contact - Alex Zhang?
R38. Please refer to response R1.
- Q39. What is the overall budget for this project? Will the full grant award amount be utilized for this contract?
R39. Please refer to response R28. Yes, the full grant amount will be utilized for this contract, if necessary.
- Q40. For the 30% conceptual design task, what level of engineering detail is anticipated (e.g., geometric layouts only, preliminary grading and drainage, utility conflicts, right-of-way mapping, environmental constraints mapping)?
R40. Please refer to response R11.
- Q41. The scope says "3-7 projects". Should proposers assume a specific number (e.g., five) for pricing purposes?
R41. Consultant should prepare at a minimum 3 projects for pricing purposes. If budget allows, additional projects may be added, up to a maximum of 7 total projects.
- Q42. What level of support will the County provide for public engagement (e.g., venue coordination, mailing lists, translation procurement, outreach through existing County channels)?
R42. Please refer to response R16. Consultants can assume to handle mailing lists, translation procurement, and public outreach.
- Q43. Has the County already identified Advisory Committee members, or is the consultant expected to recruit and confirm participation?
R43. Please refer to response R19.
- Q44. Can the County confirm the anticipated number of Advisory Committee meetings (quarterly is referenced, but total project duration suggests 6-8 meetings)?
R44. Please refer to response R21.
- Q45. Will the County provide centralized GIS datasets (transportation assets, right-of-way, utilities, EJ layers), or should consultants assume data development and cleaning as part of the scope?
R45. Please refer to response R8.
- Q46. Are certified payroll or prevailing wage requirements applicable to the 30% conceptual design task?
R46. No, certified payroll or prevailing wage requirements are not applicable to the 30% conceptual design task.

- Q47. Is a Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan required per LAPM?
R47. The County is not aware of the requirement for a QA/QC Plan per the LAPM for this Project.
- Q48. Is the Stakeholder Working Group in Task 2 different from or the same as the Advisory Committee identified in Task 6? If not the same, what is SMC's understanding of the distinction between these two groups?
R48. Task 2 is to identify a Stakeholder List, while the Advisory Committee in Task 6 will generally consist of selected members from the Project stakeholders list.
- Q49. Could the County please clarify the distinction between the evaluation criteria titled "Experience with Similar Kinds of Work" and "Demonstrated Technical Ability"?
R49. Consultant Experience with Similar Kinds of Work should describe past experiences working on similar type, planning projects, scale and complexity. Demonstrated Technical Ability evaluates the consultant's understanding of the project requirements and the quality of their technical approach.
- Q50. Could the County please confirm whether the evaluation criterion "Financial Responsibility" refers to the firm's financial stability and capacity, or to the proposed cost for this procurement?
R50. Financial Responsibility refers to the firm's financial stability and capacity.
- Q51. Given the limited timeframe between the deadline for responses to questions and the proposal due date, would the County consider granting a two-week extension to allow adequate time for proposal preparation?
R51. Please refer to response R3.
- Q52. The RFP indicates that 3-7 projects will be advanced to 30% pre-environmental conceptual design, including preliminary drawings, identification of right-of-way and utility impacts, and cost estimates.
To support consistent and competitive pricing, please clarify:
For pricing purposes, should proposers assume a specific number of projects within the 3-7 range?
Will the selected projects be of similar scale and complexity, or should proposers assume variability in project type (e.g., roadway realignment, drainage improvements, multimodal facilities, etc.)?
What level of engineering development is expected at 30% (e.g., conceptual layouts only vs. preliminary horizontal/vertical geometry, drainage concepts, utility coordination, traffic analysis, etc.)?
Are survey, geotechnical investigation, traffic analysis, or environmental technical studies expected to support the 30% effort, or should design be based on existing available data?
Would the County consider pricing this task on a per-project basis to account for variability in final project selection?
R52. Please refer to response R11 and R41.

Q53. Is the study limited to unincorporated San Mateo county or it includes the entire county?

R53. The study is limited to unincorporated areas in San Mateo County.

Q54. Will the County's Community Affairs program staff be available and/or be involved with the logistics and facilitation of Tasks 2 and 6?

R54. No, County's Community Affairs program staff will not be involved in this project.

Updated as of **March 4, 2026 at 4:00 P.M.**

F:\Users\design\C3D\E5121000_SMC Transportation Infrastructure Adaptation and Resilience Improvement Plan\RFP\RFI\RFI_County Responses.docx