

**Marsh Creek Corridor Multi-use Trail Feasibility Study
Request for Proposals
Questions and Answers**

Questions	Answers
Please post a sample contract for our review for the Marsh Creek Corridor Multi-Use Trail Feasibility Study RFP.	A sample contract can be found at the project website: http://www.cccounty.us/7004/Marsh-Creek-Corridor-Multi-Use-Feasibili
What kind of mapping information does the County have, besides the parcel map?	The County's GIS has several data layers, including general plan, zoning, roads, etc.
For the alternatives (Task 5.2), is the scope intending to create plan sheets and cross-sections covering the entire corridor, or could alternatives take the form of a series of 'typical' cross-sections and plans for selected locations?	Typical cross sections for selected locations.
What does "index sheets" refer to (referenced in "Other Restrictions/Requirements" on page 15 of the RFP)?	Typically a list of references.
Can a "cover sheet" (referenced in "Other Restrictions/Requirements" on page 15 of the RFP) include cover letter text? Or is it simply a front title/cover page?	Either would be fine.
Should project qualifications (descriptions) be included in references (as outlined in "Minimum Submittal Requirements" on page 15 of the RFP)?	That would be fine.
For outreach, the RFP scope does not specifically refer to the need for a project website, but one interpretation of Task 2.3 (Deploy Public Engagement Interface Program) is that this task calls for a project website. Please confirm.	Task 2.1, 2nd bullet calls for "an internet-based Public Engagement Interface Program." Recommendations from the consultant on if it were better to be hosted on the County website or a separate website would be welcomed.

**Marsh Creek Corridor Multi-use Trail Feasibility Study
Request for Proposals
Questions and Answers**

<p>What is corridor study width for mapping? Is there flexibility to adjust this?</p>	<p>There is no specific width but, to the extent feasible, trail concepts should be generally within the area shown on the study map (parallel to and within reasonable proximity of Marsh Creek Road and/or the creek).</p>
<p>Is the Microstation file with parcel boundaries adequate for ROW or is something more precise desired, such as review of Record Surveys and Title Reports for easements, etc.?</p>	<p>Yes, the parcel boundaries are fine for this planning level feasibility study.</p>
<p>Can we use an alternative digital camera that uses a different calibrated focal length lens if we can demonstrate that the aerial image meets project specifications?</p>	<p>If a consultant were to elect to use an approach other than Lidar technology (or what was specified in the RFP) they would have to ensure the product could be used for what it is intended; (at minimum) planning-level scale mapping.</p>
<p>Is detailed ground utility mapping envisioned or just information readily observable in the field and in utility agency files?</p>	<p>Utilities will need to be generally mapped and can be based on field observations and information obtained via coordination with the utility agencies.</p>
<p>Are the work products intended to be CAD or GIS?</p>	<p>CAD</p>
<p>Does the 12 page limit include project references with descriptions of example or relevant projects?</p>	<p>The 12 page maximum excludes cover sheet, table of contents, references, resumes and index sheets.</p>

**Marsh Creek Corridor Multi-use Trail Feasibility Study
Request for Proposals
Questions and Answers**

<p>On tasks 4.1 and 4.2- specifically the use and possible updating of the CCTA regional Travel Demand Model for the Marsh Creek corridor, including updating the model to input new plans or pending projects.</p> <p>Is it the intent of the County that the Consultant work with the current modeler to develop data on expected bike ped use of the trail or is the Consultant expected to do the requested project modeling?</p> <p>Is it acceptable to propose a more cost-effective approach to develop quantitative information regarding anticipated bike - ped use for trail options besides use of the CCTA travel demand model?</p>	<p>The consultant should use the latest version of the CCTA model but either way, the modeling results should be validated by the current CCTA model as well as a reasonable basis for the added pending projects.</p> <p>The CCTA model does not do travel demand forecasting for non-auto modes at the facility level (only to the TAZ level) so the consultant would need to develop their own approach.</p>
<p>Please verify that index sheets are the same thing as section divider pages.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>We typically provide one-page references that include a description of the project. Can you please verify that this format is acceptable...</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>...and will not count toward the 12-page limit.</p>	<p>Pages not indicated in the RFP as an exception will count toward the page maximum.</p>
<p>Is it acceptable to provide more than three references?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

**Marsh Creek Corridor Multi-use Trail Feasibility Study
Request for Proposals
Questions and Answers**

<p>Will a mapping effort of less precision than as specified in Tasks 3.3 and 3.4 in the RFP meet the County's needs for this study? We believe we can otherwise deliver the required scope without obtaining greater detail than the topographic information available through existing sources.</p>	<p>If a proposal were to recommend an alternative that could deliver a comparable or better product County staff would be open to considering it.</p>
<p>Please confirm the project extents.</p>	<p>The study corridor is from the Regency Drive area in Clayton to the Round Valley Regional Preserve staging area.</p>