San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

Questions & Answers

Request for Proposals for Consulting Services for the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension Bridging Study

Date: November 20, 2025

To: Interested Firms and Individuals

From: Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects

Subject: Request for Proposals (RFP) to Provide Consulting Services for the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) Bridging Study (RFP 25/26-02)

The Transportation Authority received the following questions in italics submitted by 5:00 p.m. on November 12, 2025.

The following questions were asked during the Pre-proposal conference held on November 10, 2025.

1. *Will any firm that is a part of this contract be precluded from performing in future contracts related to this project?*

   Participating in this contract will not preclude firms from performing future Transportation Authority contracts pertaining to the PAX Project, provided that the conflicts of interest requirements described in the response to Question #11, below, are satisfied. The results of the Bridging Study will be made available to the public.

2. *Will there be a need for surveying or polling of the community/public?*

   The Consultant team to be selected through this RFP is not anticipated to provide public surveying or polling services.

3. *Building on the answer, could you expand on the expectations for engagement for Phase A (that is not arms and legs), and outcome expected at this phase of the project?*

   During Phase A, the Consultant team is expected to provide qualified staff to serve as technical experts for a limited number of public engagement activities. Proposers should assume that for Task 4, the Consultant team would be responsible for: 1) providing information and input for the development of public engagement materials (coordinated by others) to support two rounds of outreach; and 2) attendance by two Consultant staff (project manager plus 1 support staff) at 4 public workshops, including pre-workshop coordination meetings with the

Transportation Authority; and attendance by the Consultant project manager at an estimated 6 direct stakeholder meetings.

4. *Is the Transportation Authority looking at possibly doing progressive design build as the procurement method down the road as this project goes to construction?*

   To date, the Transportation Authority has not prepared a project procurement strategy for the Project. As such, the Transportation Authority has not ruled in or ruled out any specific procurement methods. Decision-making regarding procurement method is not planned as part of the Bridging Study.

5. *Does the budget estimate for Phase A include for that technical support for Stakeholder or Outreach meetings as the type and quantity of such meetings appear unclear at this stage?*

   Please see response to Question #3, above.

6. *Do you have a target date for Right-of-Way work in this project?*

   At present, there is not a target date for right-of-way implementation for the Project.

7. *To what extent will we explore station planning?*

   The Bridging Study is expected to have a limited emphasis on station planning. During Phase A, the Study will consider station planning/design considerations as they relate to the following: 1) project interfaces, including with the existing 22nd Street Station; and 2) broad design feasibility to potentially accommodate a station within the PAX alignment, to the extent certain design options require a new station to replace the 22nd Street Station. The Study is not anticipated to include station area planning or station architectural design.

8. *Would you consider a PAX proposal that expedites the delivery of the DTX proposal cast in stone?*

   The Bridging Study scope is limited to the PAX Project. The Study is not planned to recommend changes to the configuration of The Portal/DTX project.

The following questions were submitted by 5:00 pm on November 12, 2025.

9. *Task 2 – 2.2 Adjacent & Interfacing Projects: Will the agency facilitate obtaining design files from the DTX and Railyards for the project's use? In addition, besides the DTX and Railyards projects, what additional known projects is the agency aware of?*

The Transportation Authority will facilitate obtaining design files from other agencies, as appropriate; the Consultant team will be asked to identify the plan sets/locations that are recommended to be requested from other agencies. Other known infrastructure in the Project area includes Caltrain infrastructure, Caltrans infrastructure, and City and County of San Francisco/San Francisco Public Utilities Commission infrastructure.

10. *Task 4 – Support for Community Engagement: Is technical support limited to meeting participation and developing project exhibits for community engagements?*

    Please see response to Question #3, above.

11. *Has the Transportation Authority identified any presumptively disqualifying conflicts of interest that might arise for various duties a proposer or proposer's team member(s) might hold with respect to either the Portal or the Railyards Project?*

    The Transportation Authority requires consultant services that are able to independently advise the Transportation Authority with respect to PAX and with respect to directly related projects, including The Portal and the Railyards Project.

    Specifically, the Transportation Authority requires a Consultant team with an independent core team, consisting of the project management staff and technical lead(s), who are not actively advising any of the other Railyards MOU signatories (Transbay Joint Powers Authority, Caltrain, Prologis, City and County of San Francisco, California High-Speed Rail Authority) with respect to either The Portal project or the Railyards project.

    To the extent that the proposed prime and/or subconsultant firm(s) are engaged with another agency/party with respect to The Portal or Railyards project, proposers should identify the approach to addressing any apparent, existing, or foreseeable conflicts of interest.

12. *If a subconsultant to a proposer also serves in a design role in connection with the Railyards Project, would the Transportation Authority view that subconsultant as conflicted from participating on this project?*

    Such a design subconsultant would not be prohibited from participating in the Bridging Study, provided that the requirements described in the response to Question #11, above, are satisfied.

13. *If a subconsultant to a proposer also serves in a design role in connection with The Portal, would the Transportation Authority view that subconsultant as conflicted from participating?*

    Such a design subconsultant would not be prohibited from participating in the Bridging Study, provided that the requirements described in the response to Question #11, above, are satisfied.

14. *How does the Transportation Authority envision the Bridging Study outputs being "finalized" or contractually recognized by the Portal and Railyards project partners to ensure PAX constructability is not compromised?*

    At present, the Transportation Authority has not determined the mechanism(s) by which outputs of the Bridging Study could be agreed by partner entities.

15. *Among the multiple interfaces — Portal, Caltrain, California High Speed Rail Authority, Prologis development — which are the Transportation Authority's top priorities for risk mitigation or schedule protection during Phase A?*

    The known, directly interfacing projects (Railyards project and The Portal project) are the top priorities, in terms of related project analysis and engagement during Phase A.

16. *How open is the Transportation Authority to revisiting alignment assumptions from prior studies — especially where constraints have since changed due to Railyards or Portal advancement?*

    The Transportation Authority is open to revisiting the alignment assumptions of the PAX Project. The Bridging Study is not planned to recommend changes to the configuration of The Portal project.

17. *Section V - RFP Response Requirements: Content and Format: The RFP states that no smaller than 12-point font shall be used. Can an exception be made for graphics, such as tables, charts, amps, and other similar graphic elements*

    Graphics need not adhere to the 12-point font size, as long as graphics are legible.

18. *Exhibit B – Workforce Data Spreadsheet: In order to maintain full compliance with federal requirements, Executive Order 14173, and provisions outlined in RFP 25/26-02, could the Transportation Authority please clarify the purpose of Exhibit B and provide guidance on how it should be completed? Specifically, could you explain why completion of Exhibit B is required and what information the Transportation Authority intends to obtain through this form? Could the Transportation Authority confirm whether this information should reflect the proposed project team or all staff?*

    The Transportation Authority Workforce Data Spreadsheet is for data gathering purposes, and the information is not reported or utilized in the evaluation process, and therefore not in violation of Executive Order 14173. Workforce data should reflect all staff for a firm.

19. *Are front and back covers and section dividers included in the 20-page limit?*

    Front and back covers along with section dividers are not counted towards the 20-page limit.

20. *Can a font smaller that 12-point be used in tables, graphics, and captions?*

    See response to question #17.

21. *Can you provide a sample contract for review?*

    The Transportation Authority's contract will be available during final negotiations with the selected consultant.

22. *Does the technical and management approach for Phase B count toward the 20-page limit?*

    Interested parties can, at their discretion, provide a brief narrative of their approach to Phase B. However, Phase B's final scope will be guided by the outcome of Phase A's completion. The selection of a consultant for RFP 25/26-02 will be based on proposals for Phase A.

23. *Does the approach for Phase B count towards the 20-page limit?*

    See response to question #22.

24. *Should Phase B staff be included in the organization chart and cost proposal?*

    An organizational chart and cost proposal for Phase B are not required.

25. *Question regarding Section 4: Assurances and Miscellaneous Items. We are aware that certain items such as the cover letter, resumes, exhibits and certifications are not counted toward the 20-page proposal limit. Could you please confirm whether the following are excluded as well:*

    - *B. References*
    - *C. Conflicts of Interest*
    - *D. Political Contributions*
    - *E. Confidentiality*

    A list of references, specifics of any potential or perceived conflicts of interest, list of political contributions to the Transportation Authority Board of Commissioners, and designation of any material deemed confidential are content subject to the 20-page limit.

For more information regarding the RFP, visit the Transportation Authority's website: www.sfcta.org/contracting