

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL QUESTION AND ANSWERS – SOUTHWEST CHIEF THRU-CAR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS ENGINEERING SERVICES**

Quest #	Reference	Clarification Request	Rail Commission Response
1	Task 5.2: Section 2]	Task 5.2 states “The Grantee will prepare, in conjunction with Amtrak and CDOT ridership modeling staff, ridership and travel demand forecasts. . . .” Can you clarify this statement, as it is unclear if Amtrak, CDOT ridership modeling staff, or the consultant will actually conduct the raw ridership modeling, and then collaborate with the other entities to finalize the travel demand forecasts.	It is our understanding that Amtrak will be primarily responsible for the ridership modeling as they did several years ago when they proposed the Thru-car concept from La Junta to Pueblo. With CDOT ridership modeling being conducted for the FRPR project, CDOT modeling staff should coordinate with the Amtrak modelers and also have the Consultant team ridership modelers provide a “third set of eyes” on the development of these numbers.
2	General	The front Range Passenger Rail Service Development Olan and Project Specific NEPA Engineering Services Final Report has not been finalized nor available for general review. We understand this work may be available sometime in December. Could a draft of this work be provided to ensure all teams have access to the same information?	Yes. See the Attachment # 1. It highlights current planning effort results. This is provided to Teams responding to this RFP only and is not meant for other use or distribution. The Rail Commission has not yet seen this DRAFT document.
3	General	Are the Alternatives restricted to service options for a Thru-Car service, or will the Commission consider other substantive alternatives?	The Study is an alternative analysis for thru-car service to Pueblo and Colorado Springs from La Junta. Any creative, reasonable options that a Team might propose would be considered by the Selection Panel.
4	Task 4.1 and Tasks 2.1 and 2.2	In Task 4.1, the RFP states “Grantee will incorporate appropriate input associated with Stakeholder Engagement as Part of Task 2”. Task 2 includes task 2.1, the Preliminary Purpose and Need and Task 2.2, preparing the stakeholder engagement Plan. Is the intent of the Commission to have the Grantee perform the public review and comment associated with the Preliminary Purpose and need and to implement the involvement activities identified in the requested stakeholder engagement plan?	Yes.
5	Section 6A	In the proposal instructions, 6A, item 2 reads “Consultant Team and Experience & Qualifications Section (3 page limit, 8 ½ x 11 paper or 11 x 17)”. Can we use three 8/1/2 x 11, three 11 x 17, or any combination of the two sizes?	Yes, you may use three 8/1/2 x 11, three 11 x 17, or any combination of the two size.
6	Section 6A, Item 4.	Are there limitations on what can be included on the one 11 x 17 paper in the Project Understanding and Approach Section?	No
7	General	For the Project Management Section, is the schedule included in the two-page limit?	Yes
8	General	Does an 11 x 17 count as two pages or one?	One
9	General	Would the use of RTC be required for the railroad simulation modeling or would the use of a sketch planning tool be sufficient for this study.	The railroads have indicated that something short of full rail simulation modeling, such as RTC, may be appropriate for this effort.
10	General	Are we able to include additional appendices to provide support materials (within reason)? Examples that we would like to include in a second appendix are: a. Full 1-page project sheets that are referenced in Team Experience and Qualifications. B. Additional resumes of support staff	No
11	General	On page 8 of the RFP, we would like to clarify the order of the proposed sections since they are listed as E G, and E. Please confirm that the Sections on page 8 of the RFP should be : E. Project Understanding and Approach, F. Appendix A-Resumes, and G. Small Business participation	Yes, your clarification is correct. Thank you!
12	General	Are there any reports available for the recent Front Range Passenger Rail Service Development project related to Ridership and /or Governance.	See the document (Attachment #1) provided in response to Question #2.