

**COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**CONSULTING SERVICES FOR PAVEMENT CONDITION ASSESSMENT  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
SJCDPW-RFP-26-04  
May 22, 2026**

**Question #1:** Are firms to register through the County website to obtain responses to questions **AND** to indicate interest in the solicitation?

**Answer #1:** *Q&A will be posted on County Website and BidExpress. Registered firms will receive Q&A and any other changes to the RFP.*

**Question #2:** Are submittals still to be uploaded to Bid Express, or through the County website, or by email to you?

**Answer #2:** *Section 6 – PROPOSALS SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS of the Request For Proposals prescribes two methods of submittal either hard copy or through BidExpress. Please do not email submittal to me.*

**Question #3:** Page 3 indicates the proposal limit is 50 pages but lists several exclusions. Does the "Task Effort Worksheet" mentioned on page 6 count toward this page limit, as page 7 suggests it is excluded from the maximum allowable length?

**Answer #3:** *Task Effort Worksheet is not counted toward the 50 page-limit.*

**Question #4:** In 5.2 Executive Summary, on Page 3, the description indicates the SOQ portion of the proposal shall contain detailed information (bullets A through D), however, there is no specified Statement of Qualifications "section" called out / set aside to address this information. The section headers after 5.2 Executive Summary are: 5.3 Approach and Work Plan, and 5.4 Schedule and Task Effort Worksheet. Please indicate where we are to address Bullets A through D as shown on pages 3 and 4 under Executive Summary.

**Answer #4:** *Firm will have to decide on how to describe Bullets A through D under Executive Summary.*

•  
**Question #5:** The Consultant Selection Schedule on page 8 lists the top-ranked cost proposal due date as June 24, 2026. However, page 9 states the cost proposal must be submitted within three working days after notification. Which timeline should the consultant follow for the cost proposal submission?

**Answer #5:** *The Cost Proposal from the highest Ranked firm is due on June 24, 2026 by 12:00 pm.*

**Question #6:** In Section 5.2 Executive Summary, under the Statement of Qualifications portion of the proposal, proposed staff and subconsultants information are requested. In Section 5.3 Approach and Work Plan, under Bullet A, project manager information is requested, and under Bullet B, subconsultants information is once again requested. Additionally, an organizational chart is also requested. Please confirm that you want duplicative information provided in both sections.

**Answer #6:** *Yes, we would like the information as requested in both sections.*

**Question #7:** In RFP Section 5, the total number of pages is limited to 50. Are resumes requested in Section 5.2.B counted toward the page limit, or are they excluded, similar to other noted exceptions?

**Answer #7:** *Resumes are not excluded from the page limit.*

**Question #8:** Does the County have an existing GIS shapefile or network dataset that will serve as the base for data collection? Do roadway segments currently have unique identifiers that align with OpenGov (Cartegraph) and/or StreetSaver requirements? Y

**Answer #8:** Yes

**Question #9:** The RFP requires delivery in formats compatible with both OpenGov (Cartegraph) and StreetSaver. Does the County currently maintain active licenses for both systems?

**Answer #9:** *No, the County only has active license for OpenGov only.*

**Question #10:** For the 701 miles of base network and the optional 662 miles of recently treated roads: Can the County provide functional classification (arterial, collector, local, etc.) for these roadways? Typically, because of the width of arterials and some collectors, we would recommend collecting data in each direction, which increases the mileage collected?

**Answer #10:** *Yes. This information will be in the shapefile that we provide. We are aware that some roads may require collection in both directions and may increase the mileage/centerline mileage.*

**Question #11:** In RFP Exhibit A, Task 2 states that the consultant shall prepare PCI scores using ASTM D6433 with the MTC modified distress method. Typically, the PCI calculation occurs in the PMS software. For the modified ASTM D6433 method (i.e., 8 flexible pavement distresses and 7 rigid pavement distresses), the PCI calculation is performed in StreetSaver since it has the deduct curves used by MTC (that are not readily published). OpenGov (Cartegraph) uses the standard ASTM D6433 method (i.e., 21 flexible pavement distresses and 19 rigid pavement distresses) and not the modified ASTM used by MTC. Please advise on how the PCI would be calculated.

**Answer #11:** *Our current OpenGov set up is NOT truly based on ASTM/MTC. It is a much simpler version. We would like to convert to ASTM/MTC but there are some challenges to overcome while using OpenGov. This is why we would like the consulted ratings/results to be provided using this methodology as well as the PCI/OCI score to accompany the rating breakdown. As our OpenGov contract nears expiration in April 2027, we are looking into Street Saver with the standard ASTM/MTC rating system as a viable option.*

**Question #12:** Can the County confirm whether any new roadway segments are anticipated to be added to the pavement management database as part of this effort?

**Answer #12:** *At this time, we do not have a confirmation as to whether additional segments will be added.*

**Question #13:** Will the selected consultant be expected to update existing maintenance and rehabilitation history and treatment records as part of the scope?

**Answer #13:** *No. Any updates to existing County maintenance records will be conducted by County staff.*

**Question #14:** Is your pavement management system integrated with GIS so that each pavement management section is linked to a corresponding GIS polyline?

**Answer #14:** *Yes. OpenGov syncs to GIS nightly.*

**Question #15:** Please clarify whether the Task 4 Final Report is intended to include only network condition summaries and PCI reporting, or whether budget scenarios, treatment prioritization, and pavement management recommendations are also anticipated under the base scope.

**Answer #15:** *Since this is still an option for the County, a 5-year pavement management plan will need to be tied to the Final Report.*

**Question #16:** It is assumed that IRI, similar to PCI, would be reported at the pavement management section level rather than per lane. Please confirm if this assumption is correct.

**Answer #16:** *Yes. The IRI will need to be provided for all reviewed pavement segments.*

**Question #17:** The optional request for 5-year plan and report on recommendations: Can this component be supported through Cartegraph (OpenGov)?

**Answer #17:** *If the 5-year pavement management plan is to be added, this component will need to be delivered by the consultant without the use of any County software.*

**Question #18:** Do the optional requests require involvement from a CA licensed PE?

**Answer #18:** *No. The consultant will be required to provide a description of the methodology used to produce the recommendations.*

**Question #19:** Can you elaborate on the requirement to identify feasible rehabilitation alternatives per segment? To what extent are consultants expected to provide decision-ready recommendations versus underlying data and analysis to support County-led planning efforts?

**Answer #19:** *Rehabilitation recommendations must be reasonable and be suitable for our local conditions throughout San Joaquin County. All provided conclusions must also include data (methodology, descriptions, etc.) to support the findings.*

**Question #20:** Beyond data compatibility, how does the County envision integrating deliverables into existing systems such as Cartegraph (OpenGov), GIS platforms, or other enterprise tools

**Answer #20:** *The consultant provided shapefiles and CSV will be added to our GIS datasets as well as be used to import into either Cartegraph/OpenGov or Street Saver as an inspection task.*

**Question #21:** Do you require image snapshots and/or access to a web-based image viewer?

**Answer #21:** *Photos and/or videos are a required deliverable.*

**Question #22:** Can you provide additional guidance on the expected contents and structure of the Final Report (scores and recommendations), or is the County open to different methodologies and deliverable formats?

**Answer #22:** *The County is open to different methodologies, but the PCI must be in accordance with ASTM Standard D 6433 utilizing the modified seven distress method by Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The deliverable must be as described in “Exhibit A – Preliminary Scope of Work”.*

**Question #23:** Are the recommendations in the Final Report tied to the optional request for a 5-year pavement management plan?

**Answer #23:** *Since this is still an option for the County, a 5-year pavement management plan will need to be tied to the Final Report.*