

California High-Speed Rail Authority



Request for Proposals for the Track & Systems Construction Contract

RFQ No.: HSR25-89

Questions and Responses

Round	Date
7	March 16, 2026

RFP No. HSR25-89, RFP for the Track & Systems Construction Contract

No.	Proposer Question	Authority Response
444	<p>[Agreement-TSCC Agreement - 20.3.4 and 32.4.2]</p> <p>We note that the Parties state their intention for the arrangements set out in the Project Documents to be treated as a “partnership” for U.S. federal income tax purposes under Subtitle A, Chapter 1, Subchapter K of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (Section 20.3.4). However, the TSCC Agreement also provides that nothing in the Agreement shall be construed to create any partnership, joint venture, or similar relationship between the Authority and the TSCC Contractor, and that neither party shall take the position —whether in a tax return or in any other writing—that any such relationship exists (Section 32.4.2). This appears to create a contradiction between Section 20.3.4 and 32.4.2. Could you please clarify how these provisions should be interpreted or reconciled?</p>	<p>Section 20.2.4 was removed as part of Addendum 5.</p>
574	<p>[Agreement-TSCC Agreement - 2.2.1 (e)]</p> <p>Could you please clarify the meaning of "lean construction methods"?</p>	<p>This means efficient construction to maximize value for price while minimizing waste, reducing costs, and enhancing efficiency.</p>
584	<p>[HSR25-89_TSCC_ITP_Form_J1_Addendum_4.xlsx - Package 2 spreadsheet]</p> <p>Form J1 includes imperial and metric units. We recommend the Authority uses imperial units.</p>	<p>The Authority declines the request. No change will be made to the Form J-1.</p>

RFP No. HSR25-89, RFP for the Track & Systems Construction Contract

<p>585</p>	<p>[HSR25-89-TSCC_Schedule.3of6 - Schedule 44]</p> <p>Presently, there is insufficient information to adequately price the sound walls, as Schedule 44 does not provide enough information to define wall type and attenuation requirements. We request the Authority provide the panel specification requirements including architectural finish.</p>	<p>Refer to RM 10.6 – Soundwalls. The applicable performance criteria are set out in the EIR/EIS documents included in RM.10 Environmental Documents, particularly the EIR/EIS Noise and Vibration Mitigation Guidelines and RM 10.6 – Soundwalls.</p> <p>A high-level description for the sound barriers was also provided in Addendum 3 (Guideway Sound Wall Performance Specifications and Aesthetic Guidelines).</p>
<p>586</p>	<p>[HSR25-89_TSCC_ITP_Form_J1_Addendum_4 - Package 2 spreadsheet, Cell E18]</p> <p>The Bid Item for installing Track Inner Rails has been deleted, however the owner supplied quantity for Inner Rails has substantially. Is the intent for the TSCC to price installation of Inner Rails as incidental to the Bid Item for the Ballasted within the 21 miles or will a separate Bid Item be provided?</p>	<p>Track Inner Guard Rails are listed in ITP_Form_J1_Addendum_4. They are Authority-furnished materials. The installation price is incidental to the Ballasted Track Work price.</p>
<p>587</p>	<p>[HSR25-89_TSCC_ITP - Section 3_ Procurement Schedule and Process_Table 1]</p> <p>We respectfully request Escrowed Proposal Documents Due date be one week after the Proposal is due.</p>	<p>Refer to the updated Procurement Schedule in Section 3, Table 1, included in the ITP issued with Addendum 5. The updated due date for Escrowed Proposal Documents is April 8, 2026, which is five (5) business days after the proposal due date.</p>
<p>588</p>	<p>[HSR25-89_TSCC_ITP]</p> <p>We have noticed there's a discrepancy between the ITP and the Agreement as to whether the IOS or the EOS is anticipated to start revenue service by January 1, 2032. We ask the Authority to resolve this discrepancy.</p>	<p>The Authority recently updated the revenue service to September 30, 2032.</p> <p>This will be conformed in the execution version of the TSCC Agreement.</p>

RFP No. HSR25-89, RFP for the Track & Systems Construction Contract

589	<p>[HSR25- 89_TSCC_ITP_Form_J1_Addendum_4.xlsx - PreCon & Package 1B spreadsheet, Row F]</p> <p>Column F in the Form J spreadsheet calls out a "Fully Burdened Rate". There is no definition of what goes into calculate rate. Please provide a definition for Fully Burdened Rate so we can provide this rate, unless the Authority is using fully b rate interchangeable with fully loaded rate.</p>	Form J1 has been updated in Addendum 5 to include the Fully Loaded Rate.
590	<p>[2026-02-16_HSR25-89_Questions_and_Answers_Round_5]</p> <p>In regards to RFI response #383, Please advise if authority-furnished ballast will arrive in ballast cars light-loaded to allow direct placement on the alignment, or if the TSCC contractor is expected to off-load ballast from full cars. Please also advise if diesel locomotives such as an SD40-2 (368,000 lb, 6 axle) or GP40-2 (257,000 lb, 4 axle) are acc for use within the corridor?</p>	<p>No, they will be full 100-ton loads and can be directly offloaded on the grade.</p> <p>Assume the limitation is standard Class I 286K freight cars with 6 axle locomotives with 71.5K axle loads. If train configurations are different from the above configurations, such as car weights, locomotive configurations, maintenance, or special trains, any such configurations would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.</p>
591	Regarding the use of work trains and locomotives to construct the track, please advise if the Authority will omit all rail equipment, such as locomotives, production tampers & stabilizers, threader cars, etc. from any Tier emissions standard be exempt from the requirements in schedule 8 & 9 for environmental and sustainability requirements.	The equipment referenced will not be subject to tiered emissions requirements.
592	<p>[HSR25-89_TSCC_ITP_Form_J1_Addendum_4.xlsx]</p> <p>Addendum 4 added 9ea Emergency Exits. Please provide details of station location and scope.</p>	Please refer to RM DCM 7.1 for Emergency Exits. Additional information will be provided in future package negotiations. No stations are located in CP4.

RFP No. HSR25-89, RFP for the Track & Systems Construction Contract

593	<p>[HSR25- 89_TSCC_ITP_Form_J1_Addendum_4.xlsx]</p> <p>Addendum 4 added 237ea locking systems. Please provide details of the locking systems.</p>	<p>Item description has been provided in ITP Attachment D in Addendum 4.</p>
594	<p>[Schedule 3 - Table 2]</p> <p>Schedule 3, Table 2 lists the 'Risk Analysis and Evaluation' Phase and the 'Specification of System Requirements' Phase alongside the 'System Requirements Review (SRR) Milestone'. However, Section 3.19.4 lists these phases in the 'Prelim Design (PDR) Milestone'. Please confirm if the submittals listed under Section 3.19.4 to be submitted in the PDR milestone are correct or if any need to be submitted in the prior SRR phase.</p>	<p>Refer to RM: SDLC and Schedule 3. SRR concludes the System Definition and Operational Context phase, establishing the System Requirements Baseline (SBL). The subsequent phases—Risk Analysis and Evaluation and Specification of System Requirements—occur between SRR and PDR, during which further analyses are undertaken, and the Allocated Baseline (ABL) is developed. Accordingly, the submittals listed in Section 3.19.4 are outputs of these activities and are appropriately submitted at PDR. Therefore, the timing specified for submission at PDR is correct.</p>
595	<p>[Form J1_Add_No 1 Package 2B]</p> <p>Track Item: Flagging: Information provided is insufficient to price. Please provide information detailing requirements/specifications related to flagging.</p>	<p>Form J-1 has been updated to include the bidder's price for flagging. See Section 20.4.7 of the Agreement for more information.</p>

RFP No. HSR25-89, RFP for the Track & Systems Construction Contract

596	<p>[HSR25-89-TSCC_Schedules_9_-_45_A3-Clean - Schedule 16]</p> <p>Response to Question 199 mentions the Fresno railhead layout will be designed by the winning bidder. Addendum #3 Schedule 16 (SOW) does not include any information about the Fresno railhead design. To better inform our organization and rates to be provided in J1, we ask the Authority to provide more information about the Fresno railhead design SOW the Authority intends to include in the TSCC contract, particularly which disciplines are anticipated.</p>	<p>This item is not part of packages 1 and 2. This item may be negotiated in future packages.</p>
597	<p>Can Form S be eliminated given Form G provides past performance of the Proposer?</p>	<p>The Authority declines to make this change.</p>