

Background

The anticipated contract amount and term of the Program Delivery Support (PDS) contract, as discussed at the Virtual Industry Forum, is \$380 million over 4 years starting in April 2022 and ending in March 2026, with the option to extend to up to 2 years. This contract amount, however, is dependent upon a final scope of work determination and may be broken into separate contracts.

Currently, the anticipated scope is expected to include program management, program integration and coordination, and program delivery services for the entire project, including the following areas: Strategic Delivery, Real Property, Environmental Services, Infrastructure Delivery, Engineering Services, Program Management Oversight, Contract Management, and Administration. Several key activities (Strategic Delivery, Real Property, Environmental Services, and Infrastructure Delivery) will likely transition to the PDS contract at a later date and will be performed by the current Rail Delivery Partner (RDP).

Please be advised that Project and Construction Management has been discussed as a potential new area of PDS responsibility.

Certain tasks included in the current RDP contract, including Information Technology, Finance, and Leadership tasks will be transferred to State staff and not transitioned to the expected PDS contract scope of work.

In addition to the PDS contract described above, the Authority will likely procure a separate and distinct contract for high-speed rail expertise in support to Rail & Operations, focusing on specialty skills related to testing and operations. This separate contract for high-speed rail expertise and the PDS contract will be performed by a separate consultant.

The anticipated contract or contracts, including the scope of work for each contract, contract value and term of each contract described above is subject to change and Board approval and should be noted as a draft for discussion.

In preparation for the issuance of the Program Delivery Support contract RFQ, the Authority is seeking feedback from intended Prime(s)/Joint Venture teams to the following questions:

Question 1: Given the size and term of the contract, do you intend to or need to partner with other firms and are there any issues with hitting the California High-Speed Rail Authority's Small Business Enterprise target goals?

Question 2: What do you think are the key issues and risks for the Authority program? And would any of these prevent you from bidding and why?

Question 3: Do you have examples of lessons learned from other similar major programs that would be applicable to the Authority at this point?

Question 4: Based on observations of the program's progress to date, do you have any suggestions to the Authority on strategies and approaches that would advance delivery and promote the benefits of the Authority's program to the public?

Based on our earlier description of the expected scope (Questions 5-8):

Question 5: What are the advantages/disadvantages of the proposed structure? How does this affect your teaming considerations?

Question 6: How would you propose to structure the future /optional work areas to be potentially added to the expected PDS contract scope – such as Project and Construction Management? What is your experience in managing Project Construction Managers?

Question 7: Which element of scope, if any, do you think could restrict competition most?

Question 8: What interface issues does the expected scope present, if any?

Conflict of Interest (Questions 9 and 10):

Question 9: Have you reviewed the Organizational Conflict of Interest Policy? Do you believe you are conflicted on any elements of the scope?

Question 10: Are there other Authority opportunities you would prefer to work on instead of PDS contract (e.g., the separate and distinct contract for high-speed rail expertise)?

The following transition questions pertain only to Engineering Services, PMO, Contract Management and Administration which transition to the PDS contract immediately following notice to proceed and excludes the extended transition scope items previously mentioned. (Questions 11 – 12):

Question 11: What risks are there for the Authority in the potential transition between partners and how would you suggest mitigating and managing those risks?

Question 12: How long would you allow for the transition?

Key Performance Indicators (Questions 13-14):

Question 13: To the extent allowed by law, would you accept some element of performance at risk against program objectives such as program cost and/or schedule?

Authority Questions for PDS Intended Primes/Joint Venture Teams

- Where would incentive payments be appropriate?
- Where would gain sharing/pain sharing be appropriate?
- At what level should a cap be set on downside risk?

Question 14: What types of KPIs do you think are most appropriate for this type of contract; could you give examples that have been successful on other major programs?

Key Personnel (Questions 15-16):

Question 15: How many key roles do you envision for this type of contract? What retention issues, if any, do you foresee?

Question 16: How important is co-location in the post-COVID era? For example: availability and policies. Do you require office space to be provided? Should it be required of the PDS consultant?

Procurement (Questions 17-18):

Question 17: How long do you think is necessary to form a team and respond to a one phase request for qualification (RFQ) process from issuance of the RFQ to SOQ submission?

Question 18: Are you concerned about resourcing any other major competing or conflicting procurements?

Other feedback (Question 19):

Question 19: Do you have any other additional feedback or comments to share with the Authority?