

Apex Rail Switching Operations Request for Qualifications

Questions and Responses

September 27, 2023

Q1. The selected Consulting Firm is required to be a registered vendor with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Town of Cary.

- **1.1 - Which disciplines on each form are required to be an eligible bidder on the subject effort?**
- **1.2 - Who would be CAMPO's appropriate Point of Contact listed on the City of Cary registration?**

A1.1. Generally, rail and highway planning and design experience will be required for this study. Beyond that, it is up to the judgement of the person(s) submitting a proposal to decide whichever additional disciplines might be deemed necessary to cover the tasks listed in the scope.

A1.2. Juliet Andes, the Assistant Transportation Director at the Town of Cary - juliet.andes@carync.gov

Q2. Your reference to the traffic volumes at or near affected rail crossings pertain to the current location. What role does the Traffic Engineer play? Are the post-relocation traffic volumes associated with the alternate rail switching locations to be projected as part of the required scope? If so, what role does CAMPO see such volumes and the existing volumes playing in the effort?

A2. The traffic volume element for the current location has to do with the safety issues presently experienced in the study area. There will likely need to be a traffic analysis component for the alternate locations that are explored through this study, to determine what potential impacts there might be if the rail switching operations are relocated to those locations.

Q3. Your reference to the noise and vibration data pertains to the current scenario. Are the post-relocation noise and vibration data associated with the alternate rail switching locations to be projected as part of the required scope? If so, what role does CAMPO see such data and the existing data playing in the effort?

A3. There will likely be a component of the suitability analysis for alternate locations that will include consideration for potential noise and vibration impacts. However, it is not anticipated that a full noise and vibration analysis will be needed.

Q4. The scope described in the most recent CAMPO FY UPWP - FINAL document regarding the Apex Rail Yard Relocation Study envisions a grade-separated crossing in Apex. This is not mentioned in the scope described in the RFQ. Is such a grade separation included in the contracted feasibility scope?

A4. The grade-separated crossing was included in the original scope for this study when it was posted at the end of March. This is the second time we are posting an RFQ for this study, and certain scope elements were removed/modified – the grade-separated crossing is one of the elements that was removed and will not be included in the scope of this study.

Q5. Page 3 of 7 in the RFQ refers to “possible opportunities to move the CSX maintenance facility” whereas later that page references the “process of relocating the CSX rail switching operations out of downtown Apex”. (Emphasis added in both cases.) Does the study aim to facilitate the achievement of one or both of those objectives?

A5. The study aims to explore the feasibility of relocating the *CSX rail switching and yard operations* out of downtown Apex.

Q6. What specific government entities are funding the study? What, if any, specific, non-government parties are funding the study ? The latest CAMPO FY UPWP – FINAL does not specify all of the funding sources.

A6. The study is being jointly funded by the Town of Apex (\$50,000) and the Capital Area MPO (\$50,000).

Q7. While the specified deliverables include “preparation of materials that can be used for grant application(s) towards federal or state funding,” the “Tasks and Outcomes expected under this project include Preparing a grant application, based on identified funding sources.” Which is it ? Is full grant preparation expected ?

A7. That was a mistake under the Tasks and Outcomes. The expectation is that this contract will produce materials sufficient for inclusion in a grant application, and *not* an actual application.

Q8. The CAMPO FY UPWP- FINAL document contains a table within the “Apex Rail Yard Relocation Study” that sets a budget of \$100,000. Does this pertain only to the feasibility and analysis portions of the scope ? Or the scope in its entirety? Is that budget mount subject to revision or should bidders operate under the assumption that that limit can be relaxed if that limit is inadequate to carry out the entire specified scope ?

A8. The \$100,000 is the budgeted amount for this study and is expected to cover the entire scope of work listed in the RFQ. The expectation is that consultants submitting a proposal are able to complete the requested scope of work for the amount budgeted.

Q9. The RFQ Schedule states that “CAMPO Responses Posted By 5 PM EST”. Will this posting be accessible via the link to the RFQ ? Or will there be an alternate location to view the responses? If so, how can the post be accessed?

A9. A questions and responses document will be posted to the RFQ notice page by the date and time noted on the RFQ schedule.