

# A Standard LRV RFP – One Year Later

**Richard J. Wieczorek**

*S.F. Bay Area Rapid Transit District  
Department Manager Procurement  
Oakland, California*



**2012 RAIL CONFERENCE**





American Public Transportation Association  
1666 K Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20006-1215  
July 25, 2011

## **Light Rail Vehicle Request for Proposals (RFP) Procurement Guideline**



# Agenda

- History
- The Document
- Its' One Year Life
- Moving Forward
- Final Thoughts



# History

- April 2009 – Work Group commences Rail Terms and Conditions document
- October 2010 – Rail Terms and Conditions finished by Work Group
- May 2011 – T&Cs/Tech groups meet to edit and finalize document



# The Document

Designed for

- Fairness
  - Consistency
    - Flexibility



# The Document

The **Notice of Request for Proposals (RFP)** (Section 1) contains general information to prospective proposers regarding the RFP package and can also be used as notification of the RFP to the public or an advertisement of the procurement opportunity.

The **Instructions to Proposers** (Section 2) provides detailed requirements that proposers must follow in submitting their proposals. This section also includes evaluation criteria and information of interest to the Proposer regarding Agency contract award procedures.

The **General Conditions** (Section 3), once customized by each Agency, should contain the standard terms and conditions and should be modified only by language added in the Special Provisions section.

The **Special Provisions** (Section 4) should be customized to meet the Agency's specific requirements for each individual project or contract, as well as local and state requirements. They are intended to amend and supplement the General Conditions to meet the individual requirements of each project.

The **Federal Clauses** are included as Section 5.

The **Technical Specifications** are attached as Section 6.

The **Warranty Provisions** are contained in Section 7.

**Quality Assurance** (Section 8) covers manufacturing, inspection and acceptance procedures.

Under normal practice, **Forms and Certifications** (Section 9) are submitted with the proposal or the Proposal may be considered nonresponsive.

**Appendixes** are included as Section 10.



# The Document

Each Section can be tailored by Agency:

IP 16. Agency-Specific Provisions  
[Insert as required]

- Contains examples of multiple evaluation and selection processes
- Contains sample milestones and milestone payment tables



# The Document

## SECTION 6: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

- TS1. Introduction
- TS2. Design and Performance Criteria
- TS3. Carbody
- TS4. Coupler
- TS5. Operator's Cab
- TS6. Passenger Doors
- TS&. Heating, Ventilation and AC
- TS\*. Lighting
- TS9. Electrical
- TS10. Propulsion
- TS11. Truck Functional Desc and Perf Reqts
- TS12. Braking Equipment
- TS13. Communications
- TS14. Automatic Train Control
- TS15. Interior
- TS16. Trainline and Local Signal Architecture
- TS17. Monitoring and Diagnostics
- TS18. Software Systems
- TS19. Materials and Workmanship
- TS20. Program Management and QA
- TS21. Requirements Management
- TS22. Agency-Furnished Equipment
- TS23. Passenger Emergency Equipment






# The Document

## TS 2.2. General Vehicle Configuration

### TS 2.2.1 General Characteristics

1. The vehicle underframe shall be constructed of [Agency to insert].
  2. The carbody skin shall be [Agency to insert].
  3. The carbody shall have [three] sections, meeting at [two] articulations.
  4. The vehicle shall be of a [Agency to insert] percent low-level design.
  5. The vehicle shall be equipped with [Agency to insert] passenger doorways, [Agency to insert] per side, directly across from one another.
- 

# The Document

Consensus based agreement between Agency and Industry on areas such as:

- Data Rights
- Force Majeure events
- Sustainability
- Cap on Liquidated Damages
- Warranty duration on Major Subsystems
- Extended warranties at Agency cost



# Its' One Year of Life

Spotted in conjunction with

- Detroit – for its proposed LRT which was suspended
  - Houston Metro
    - PRIAA bi-level intercity rail car recently released by CalTrans (T&Cs only)



# Its' One Year of Life

## Regarding Detroit

- Initial reticence to adopt commercial clauses – “homegrown is better”
- Gradual movement toward use
- Technical spec more readily embraced



# Its' One Year of Life

## Regarding Houston METRO

- Considered RFP well written
- Utilized with modifications
- Recognize “standard” sections tailored with local requirements
- Successful award, endorse its use



## Its' One Year of Life

Regarding PRIAA – State of California

- Greatest success story to date
- Released April 20, 2012
- Terms and Conditions portion format almost “mirror” copy of LRV RFP
- Text “true to intent”, but written Caltrans specific



# Its' One Year of Life

## LRV RFP:

### Table of Contents

#### SECTION 1: NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

- NR 1. Title/Description of the Work to be Done
- NR 2. Obtaining Proposal Documents
- NR 3. Proposal Due Date and Submittal Requirements
- NR 4. Cost for Proposal Documents
- NR 5. Validity of Proposals
- NR 6. Pre-Proposal Meeting Information
- NR 7. Identification of Source of Funding



## Caltrans Bi-Level RFP:

### Table of Contents

- NR 1. Title/Description of the Work to be Done
- NR 2. Obtaining Proposal Documents
- NR 3. Proposal Due Date and Submittal Requirements
- NR 4. Cost for Proposal Documents
- NR 5. Validity of Proposals
- NR 6. Pre-Proposal Meeting Information
- NR 7. Identification of Source of Funding



# Moving Forward

- Document is both *highly* organized and *logically* organized. Intended to minimize “*hunt and search*” for related requirements
- It’s standardized solicitation and proposal format should make the process easier for all parties
- The T&Cs are “*reasonable*” and intended to share the risks between the Agency and the Vehicle Manufacturer
- The Technical Specifications are comprehensive and tailorable





# Moving Forward

## What's left

- Rail Vehicle Consultants and Agencies need to embrace and use It !
  - Gather Feedback and Modify It !
    - Ballot It !



**- Final Thoughts -**  
**Transportation and Housing and Urban  
Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations  
Bill, 2013 – Senate Report 112-157**

**Committee Recommendation:**

“For the past several years, FTA has worked with the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) to broker broad agreement on a standard transit bus and light rail vehicle that could cut transit agencies’ future capital costs. The success of this initiative would expedite transit vehicle procurement, while providing maximum benefit from taxpayers’ investment in transit systems..... The Committee supports these efforts and directs FTA to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by October 15, 2012, on its progress to date and the primary obstacles to reaching agreement on standard bus and light rail vehicles.”





THANK YOU

