Question #1: Would SRTA please consider extending the deadline for bids to ensure that respondents are able to develop the most comprehensive proposal and secure the best resources to meet the State’s needs?

Answer #1: No extension to the August 22\textsuperscript{nd} proposal submission deadline is contemplated at this time.

Question #2: Page 16 of the RFP, Section 3.5: Statement of Firm’s Qualifications and Experience states that the section should include “Proposed project approach and plan in response to the Scope of Services.” Section 3.6: Project Approach and Team also states that section should include “Firm’s technical approach to the project and interpretation of the Scope of Services, including the Tasks identified in the Scope of Services section”. Can SRTA please clarify what you are expecting to see regarding each bullet in 3.5 and 3.6 respectively?

Answer #2: Please see Addendum No. 1 to SRTA Solicitation No. 18-065 for the revised Sections 3.5 and 3.6.

Question #3: Is it permissible to use prior work completed with SRTA as a contact and reference for the current solicitation?

Answer #3: The required references should be for work that was performed for entities that do not have appointed members to the Commission. By way of example and not limitation, references from the State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA), the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA), the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), the Chatham Area Transit Authority (CAT), and the Georgia Transit Association (GTA) will not be accepted or reviewed, due to their respective agency heads serving as members of the Commission.

Question #4: Under Part 2 – Scope of Services, Item 3.2, under the first paragraph, bullet four, “an accounting of transit assets (facilities, rolling stock, etc.) for all systems…” Question: Does the SRTA definition of assets include non-revenue vehicles, operating and maintenance equipment and technology equipment? In addition, will the consultant be responsible for completing a state of good repair condition assessment of an agency’s assets if the agency has not completed its own conditioning assessment?

Answer #4: For purposes of the deliverable associated with Item ”3.2 Task 2: Analysis of Existing Transit Systems and Conditions,” the definition of assets need not include non-revenue vehicles, but shall include
revenue vehicles, operating and maintenance equipment and technology equipment. Further, Consultant shall not be responsible for completing an independent State of Good Repair condition assessment of an agency’s assets, where an agency has not completed its own condition assessment, as such an effort is beyond the scope of this contract. In cases where State of Good repair assessments are available from Georgia transit agencies, that information should inform and be included in the awarded Consultant’s Task 2 deliverables. Where such information is unavailable, we would anticipate the selected Consultant’s Task 2 deliverables would note the unavailability of such data.

Question #5: In view of the comprehensive nature of the services required, including wide-ranging analysis of transit governance models and the development of a statewide transit system plan, the care warranted in planning a technical approach, and the personal and public holidays during this period, will SRTA grant an extension of the period available to submit proposals to September 13, 2017?

Answer #5: No extension to the August 22nd proposal submission deadline is contemplated at this time. The comprehensive nature of the services requested should not impact Proposers’ ability to outline the overall technical approach they will take towards the project as part of their technical proposal submission, even if it is not possible to develop specific time lines and details for each major step of their work plan.

Question #6: What are the sources of funding payments to the consultant for these services, and will they affect the manner in which consultant carries out the services or is compensated? What information can you provide regarding the amount of funds available for the project and the expected expenditure for the project?

Answer #6: Specific funds were appropriated by the General Assembly and the Governor to the Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank in SRTA’s FY18 budget (HB 44). A portion of these funds were set aside specifically for consultation services related to a statewide transit study. These funds shall be the source of payments for the contract awarded pursuant to this procurement in order to carry out the goals of the transit commission established in HR 848.

Question #7: How and through which personnel will the Authority communicate and work with the Commission regarding this project? Will the Authority be directing the consultant, reviewing the consultant’s work, or supporting the consultant’s interaction with the Commission? Regarding RFP Part 1, Section 4.2, will the Selection Committee and/or the Evaluation Committee be comprised of SRTA staff?

Answer #7: The consultant will communicate with the Commission and with staff as designated by the Commission Chair. SRTA staff will support the Commission as needed and requested by the Commission. In addition, SRTA staff will administer the contract, including the review and processing of payments pursuant to the contract terms and conditions.

Question #8: Who will have responsibility for scheduling Commission meetings and arranging the logistics, recording proceedings, advising the Commission on its procedures, and documenting any actions taken by the Commission?

Answer #8: Responsibility for scheduling Commission meetings and arranging the logistics such as recording proceedings is the responsibility of the Commission and assigned committee aides/staff. SRTA
procurement staff will advise the Commission on the procurement and contractual process/procedures. Commission actions will be documented in the normal conduct of its deliberations.

**Question #9:** The scope of work (Part 2, Section 3) provides for seven tasks. The term of contract (Part 1, Section 1.2) provides for one base year and two one-year options. (a) Are the options to be exercised by mutual agreement of the parties? (b) Which tasks, or portions of tasks, or other services should be allocated to the optional second and third year of services?

Answer #9: (a) The intent is that the contract extensions be exercisable in the sole discretion of SRTA, on behalf of the Commission. (b) In order for the Commission to be able to consider any recommendations set forth in "3.3 Task 3: Early Observations and Opportunities Assessment" of the Scope of Services, it is desired that Proposers plan to complete Tasks 1 -3 by December 31, 2017. Proposers should suggest their timing for all remaining tasks (Tasks 4 –7) such that the Commission has sufficient time to consider the complete work of the consultant and prepare and file its (the Commission’s) final report with the Clerk of the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 2018, as set forth in Section 7 of HR 848. The requested contract extensions are to give SRTA, on behalf of the Commission the flexibility to continue to work with the Consultant in the event that the work of the Commission is extended by the Speaker of the House as permitted under the provisions of HR 848 and possibly beyond if certain wrap up work is necessary beyond the timeframe set forth in HR 848.

**Question #10:** Is there a specific Georgia, federal, or other definition of “mass transportation” that will govern the Commission’s considerations? More specifically, will it include any intercity bus or rail services, taxi services, transportation network company services, or other privately owned and funded services? Will it include Medicaid funded transportation?

Answer #10: O.C.G.A. Section 32-9-1 defines “mass transportation” as “…all modes of transportation serving the general public which are appropriate, in the judgment of [GDOT], to transport people, commodities, or freight by highways, rail, air, water, or other conveyance, exclusive of wires and pipelines.” However, HR 848 and the work of the House Commission on Transit Governance and Funding are expressly focused on transit; therefore, Proposers shall use the following modified definition:

> Mass Transportation shall mean “all modes of transportation serving the general public which are appropriate to transport people by local roads, highways, rail, or other conveyance, exclusive of air or water.”

Utilizing the preceding definition nothing precludes the contemplation or inclusion of intercity bus or rail services, taxi services, transportation network company services, or other privately owned and funded services. Further, Medicaid funded transportation is in scope.

**Question #11:** Task 4 and the derivative tasks provides for investigating transit needs through 2040. Will it be acceptable to prioritize and plan for more detail on the nearer term portions of this planning horizon? Will it be productive to consider some implications of the developments beyond this horizon?

Answer #11: Yes, to both.