RFP / TITLE
CONTACT
EMAIL
PHONE NUMBER
SUBMITTAL DUE DATE
Q&A ISSUE DATE

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #01 071751 2023 Civil/Structural On-Call Engineering Services Jerry Clardy, Sr. Contracts Administrator procurement@portoftacoma.com

253-888-4751 FEB 1, 2023 @ 2:00 PM (PDT) JAN 26, 2023

#	Question	Answer	Question #
1	Page 10 of the RFQ states that a "redacted version (removing all Company information)" be provided along with the submittal. Is the intent that simply the company name be redacted (i.e. logos, firm name within the text, etc.) or is the intent that any possible identifying information be redacted (i.e. company history, team member bios/resumes, recent projects, references, etc.)?	You may leave your information as is a NOT redacted. The template that was used was from an older version. The Port will submit an addendum for clarification.	Q-001472
2	References have 10 points in the Qualifications & Experience Section on pg 6 and on pg 7 listed as Pass/Fail? We assume the 10 points are accurate?	Page 7, "References (0 pts)" refers only to the checks and/or verification of the references submitted to address other criteria from the RFQ. Only 10 points is available as part of the Qualification and Experience category and no additional points will be awarded for information attained through verification of said references.	Q-001477
3	Would the Port consider a 1 week extension on the due date?	No extension for the procurement	Q-001477
4	Please confirm that the proposal page limit is eight pages in total, double sided.	eight single pages only.	Q-001476
5	Please clarify if resumes of proposed staff will be counted in above page count. Page five of the RFQ seems to imply that these will be counted, but page six says that they won't.	An appendix of individual resumes will not be counted in the page limit.	Q-001476

	Please clarify the evaluation points value for the References. On page six of the RFQ, it says they are worth 10 points and on page seven, it says they are worth zero points (and may or may not be checked).	For Qualifications & Experience bullet #6, include references and project information on reprojects you wish to highlight in your SoQ in the body of your SoQ. They will be scored at 10 point scale as stated. For References (0 pts), this refers to any checks or verification of the references that may may not be performed at the Port's sole discretion. If the Port does opt to check reference additional points will be awarded.	the
•	Please clarify the desired location of the References information within the submittal. On page six of the RFQ, it says they should be included in Section 1 (Qualifications & Experience). On pages five and seven, it seems to imply that they should be in an Appendix.	References should be in the body of your SoQ.	Q-001476
	Please clarify the meaning of the below text on page ten of the RFQ (directions for submittal on portal): "Please provide one (1) non-redacted version, and one (1) redacted version (removing all Company information) of your PDF submittal." Is the above referring to if we include proprietary, confidential or trade secret information in our submission? If so, please confirm that if we do not include proprietary information in our submittal, that only one (non-redacted) pdf submission is acceptable.	Please only submit the Un-Redacted copies. Radacted copies are not needed.	Q-001476
	Please confirm that Attachment C (Rate Sheet) is included as an example only and that we are not required to include rates in our Statement of Qualifications.	Rates should not be included in the SoQ.	Q-001476
)	Contracting Entity: Please clarify which entity is the leading and will the contract be executed with – The Port of Tacoma or NWSA.	This will be a NWSA lead contract but the contract will support PoT projects as well	Q-001479

Section 5: Request to exclude from the audit extent the consultant rates or percentage multipliers.	Per the RFQ pages 1 and 2 The NWSA/Port's Standard Terms and Conditions are included as Attachment B to this solicitation. By submitting a Proposal, the Proposer represents that it has carefully read Request for Qualifications (RFQ) # 071751 Page 3 of 26 Request for Qualifications 2023 Civil/Structural On-Call Engineering Services and agrees to be bound by the NWSA/Port's Standard Terms and Conditions. Identify during the question submittal and response period, any sections you consider onerous, clarify why you consider these sections onerous, propose alternative language, and describe why it is in the NWSA/Port's best interests to adopt the alternative language. Taking exceptions to these terms and conditions or conditioning your proposal on terms and conditions other than the NWSA/Port's will render your proposal non-responsive. * By submitting a proposal, the Proposer represents that it has carefully read all attachments. As applicable, proposers shall identify propose alternate wording, if any, to these documents as an appendix to their submitted proposal. There was no information provided as to the terms being onerous or a proposed revision that include why it is in our best interest to change the clause.	
12 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 6: Propose additional wording of the Ownership of Intellectual Property (IP) in relation to the use and responsibility of the documents/data produced under the Services.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
13 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 7: Propose wording to further clarify the confidentiality obligations beyond the standard clause provided.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
14 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 8: Request to remove the condition of invoice submission date limit of 90 days after works are completed and to modify payment period to 30 days from billing.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
15 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 10: Propose additional wording on this section for Standard of Care, its duration to be 12 months limit, implied warranties and exclusion of repairs and replacement costs.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
16 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 11: Request to remove the term that Time is of The Essence as a construction term not a professional service term and supplement the clause with occurrences beyond the control of the parties and force majeure components.	*See Item 11	Q-001479

17 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 13: Request a 30 calendar days curation period.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
18 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 14: Propose to provide steps for dispute resolution before proceeding to mediation.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
19 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 15: Propose to add that the parties waive their right to trial by jury.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
20 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 18: Propose clarification on limitation of third parties, proportionate liability and inclusion of defense and/or attorney's fees.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
21 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 22: Propose wording in the insurance claim and aggregate liability.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
22 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Section 30: Propose to remove clause as we consider is not applicable to Professional Services.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
23 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Add a new Section 32 for notices between the parties.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
24 To provide clarity we request the review of the following clauses: Add a new section 33 to provide an order of precedence of documents.	*See Item 11	Q-001479
25 Exhibit 24.D: Please advise what the Port of Tacoma refers to by "Construction Management" services. We require this information to ensure that our contracting entity has the correct licensure to undertake this service. Similarly, the Davis Bacon language should be excluded.	*See Item 11	Q-001479

26 We believe that the Request for Qualifications #071751 for 2023 Civil/Structural On-Call Engineering Services includes inconsistent statements regarding acceptable content in SOQs, and that this should be clarified in an addendum. Based on the two statements listed below, it is not clear whether an appendix with resumes counts toward the 8 page limit.

On page 5 of 26, the RFQ states:

Proposals are limited to 8 numbered pages (8 1/2 by 11 inch) including the cover letter and any submitted appendices, but excluding references.

On page 6 of 26, the RFQ states:

Resumes of the key individuals are to be included as an appendix and are not included in the total page count. Resumes are to be limited to one single-sided, letter-size page. Resumes exceeding this limit will not be reviewed.

an addendum will be forthcoming with clarified information

Email