



## ADDENDUM 1

Request for Proposals  
Comprehensive Operations Plan for Second Transfer Hub  
and Renewable Energy Source Options  
RFP #2023-06

**Please ensure you acknowledge ADDENDUM 1 in your bid submission on form I “Signature Page/Acknowledgement of Addenda”.**

Below is a list of questions received by October 12<sup>th</sup> 2023. The answers are below in red.

- 1.) In Task 5, the scope states: *Task 5: Perform Capital Needs Inventory*  
*The selected Contractor currently operates an on-street secondary transfer hub located on Springfield’s south side. The selected Contractor shall evaluate how well the transportation hub currently serves riders’ needs and how well the District’s new secondary transfer hub site will more efficiently serve riders.*

We are unclear on the language in this section. Does the District want an analysis of the new south side transfer hub? Where does the service analysis of the proposed west side transfer hub occur and is that what you are asking consultants to focus on?

The District requests that the Contractor evaluate both the efficiency, effectiveness, and usefulness of the current on-street secondary hub to meet the needs of passengers, as well as provide an analysis and proposal for a future secondary transfer hub that would more effectively meet the needs of passengers and SMTD. It is the intent of the District that the Contractor evaluate current services while making recommendations for future improvements. Whether those improvements involve the southside, westside, or a combination of either location is to be determined by the Contractor’s proposal for this study.

- 2.) In Task 5, the scope states: *The selected Contractor shall meet with relevant stakeholders to determine which services the District shall provide at the new secondary transfer hub in the near- and long-term, given the area’s demographics and stakeholder input.*

Does this sentence refer to the south side site or the proposed west side location?

There is no proposed west side location. The new off-street location would replace the existing on-street location in the same general area (within a few hundred yards). The District requests that the Contractor evaluate both the efficiency, effectiveness, and usefulness of the current on-street secondary hub to meet the needs of passengers, as well as provide an analysis and proposal for a future secondary transfer hub that would more effectively meet the needs of passengers and SMTD. It is the intent of the District that the Contractor evaluate current services while making recommendations for future improvements. Whether those improvements involve

the southside, westside, or a combination of either location is to be determined by the Contractor's proposal for this study.

- 3.) In Task 6: Evaluate Potential Fueling Needs, the scope states:

*Using the collected information, the selected Contractor shall develop site and building requirements for this new secondary transfer hub facility given the District's operational needs. The selected Contractor shall evaluate whether this secondary transfer hub shall include a fueling station using alternative fuels. This evaluation shall include but not be limited to the following fuels: compressed natural gas, fully electric, hydrogen fuel cell, and propane.*

Is the District asking the consultant to assess including a fueling facility at an operating passenger transfer facility? Does the "secondary transfer hub" refer to the proposed west side location or the new south side location?

The District requests that the Contractor evaluate a comprehensive operations plan for a secondary transfer hub and for renewable energy fueling solutions, which may include the need for a new fueling facility. Additionally, see response to #1. The secondary transfer hub is located on a larger property SMTD can utilize for multiple operational needs. The secondary transfer hub will be constructed first on roughly 20% of a much larger property. Future use could be fueling, storage, etc. on adjacent space on the larger property.

- 4.) On page 41 of the RFP, there is a requirement for audits of the project based on our FAR rates and overheads. However, Section 2.0 Evaluation identifies the need to provide a firm, fixed price for the project. These two requirements are inconsistent. Can the District please provide clarity?

This is a firm fixed price project. Section 41 is standard language required by IDOT. If an audit report is prepared then it is subject to review by the Grantor. In addition, in the event of a single proposal (Section 8.0), then the District is required to perform a cost analysis, which may result in the request of overhead rates, to determine that the price is fair and reasonable.

- 5.) Has the District established an overall budget for this study?

The District does not disclose its budget for projects.

- 6.) Would the District like the analysis of the electrolyzer system to include compressing, storing, and dispensing fuel into vehicles so that it is comparable to the analysis related to a station that receives delivered fuel?

Yes

7.) Would the District like the Contractor to evaluate both depot and on-route charging as part of its analysis of fully electric alternative fuels?

Yes, in so far as we want all cost estimates available in order to make a fully-explored decision.

8.) Will work on this RFP preclude a company on bidding on any potential design work of a new transfers hub or O&M facility?

The District is seeking further clarification on this question. A second addendum will be issued to address this question by Thursday, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

9.) Do you have a budget for this project?

The District does not disclose its budget for projects.

10.) Task 6 states, “evaluate the costs to remove fuel storage tanks, including the full costs of removal as required by 415 ILCS 5/57.5, for both the diesel fuel and CNG tanks.” Are these tanks already identified near the potential second transfer hub or at another location?

These tanks are located at the District’s Administration and Maintenance buildings at 928 S 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Springfield, IL 62703.

11.) Task 7 asks for cost estimates for “environmental remediation”. Are there existing studies on the current conditions of the potential site or is the proposer expected to perform environmental assessment?

Task 7 asks for cost estimates for environmental remediation. Task 7 does not ask for the Contractor to perform an environmental assessment. NEPA indicated possible issues with any tree removal on the property. Any cost associated with that would be part of how the future projects would be planned. Much of the property has no trees. So, making that NEPA report available should be adequate at this point.

12.) Is there a DBE Goal for this project?

DBE participation is greatly encouraged on all SMTD projects. Although there is no goal set for this project the District urges proposers to work with DBEs whenever possible.