



Purchasing Department
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607

December 14, 2022

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No.: 22-23/10, As-Needed Consulting Services for Sea Level Rise and Groundwater Intrusion Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Plan

This Addendum modifies the original RFP Documents for the above-mentioned RFP. **Acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the space provided on the RFP Acknowledgement and Signature Form (Attachment 3). Failure to do so may disqualify your proposal.**

The following questions were submitted by the deadline and are answered in this addendum.

1. **Question:** Can the Port please extend the deadline to submit by one week to January 13? Our staff is on a well-deserved break from December 23 until January 3. Having some extra time in the New Year to prepare the proposal would be greatly appreciated.

Answer: No. The Proposal was issued on November 17, 2022. In anticipation of the holidays, the Port extended the deadline to January 6th, for a total of more than seven weeks, as opposed to a December deadline.

2. **Question:** What exactly counts towards the 20-page limit. Does this include: Covers, tabs, cover letter, TOC, back end sections (fee, forms, etc.)?

Answer: The 20-page limit applies to your entire response. All other attachment/backup documentation will not count against the page limit. Covers, tabs and cover letter, TOC and back covers will not count towards the 20-page limit.

3. **Question:** Who developed 2016 XPSWMM model for the Port?

Answer: The model was produced by Wood Rodgers.

4. **Question:** Is there a recording of the pre-proposal meeting?

Answer: No, the non-mandatory pre-proposal was not recorded.

5. **Question:** Is there a possibility that questions submitted prior to Dec 7 be responded to prior to December 14?

Answer: All answers will be posted on December 14th.

6. **Question:** Can you please state again what the expected period of performance is?

Answer: The third paragraph of the Project Overview section lists the contract term as five (5) years.

7. **Question:** Is the Port coordinating with the City regarding Adaptation Strategies or will these be only for Port Lands?

Answer: This project is Port-specific. No coordination with the City of Oakland is currently planned.

8. **Question:** Do you foresee any additional stakeholder input into this work, beyond Port of Oakland?

Answer: The project does not foresee any additional stakeholder input.

9. **Question:** Costing for Task 4 will be dependent on tasks 2 & 3 and direction from the Port. Can costs be provided as a range for specific tasks?

Answer: Ranges are challenging to compare. Instead, costs should be broken down (itemized) to the extent possible. If the Port requests action A, then this will add cost X. If the model for Task 2 shows B, then explain how this dependency will alter the cost in Task 4.

10. **Question:** Would the Port like to see deliverables in a format (beyond GIS deliverables) that do not require GIS capability such as web based content?

Answer: The Port has an ArcGIS Online (AGOL) license for staff to review GIS files. If the files are not usable in AGOL, and you believe the Port needs to review these files, then please make accommodations for this in your scope.

11. **Question:** In preparation for the proposal, would the Port provide the XPSWMM model that has been built for the Airport?

Answer: The XPSWMM model is not currently available for public consumption.

12. **Question:** Does the port have the latest LiDAR data?

Answer: The Port has orthorectified aerial imagery of the entire Port area. We don't currently have LiDAR imagery.

13. **Question:** Is the Port aware of any current or previous LiDAR surveys of the Port that would be made available for modeling and analysis?

Answer: The Port has orthorectified aerial imagery of the entire Port area. We don't currently have LiDAR imagery.

14. **Question:** Can the Port provide information again on how the 15 pt. rating bonus is calculated among subconsultants?

Answer: Generally, proposals are awarded points as follows:

Proposers may be awarded up to a maximum of five (5) preference points depending on the proportionate share of work, calculated based on the contract amount, to be done by LBABE and LIABE certified prime consultant(s) and subconsultants: a. If all the contract work is to be performed at the prime consultant's and subconsultants' respective offices within the LIA, the proposer will be awarded 5 points; or b. If all the contract work is to be performed at the prime consultant's and subconsultants' respective offices within the LBA, the proposer will be awarded 2.5 points; or c. If the contract work is to be divided among prime consultants and subconsultants with offices located within the LIA, LBA and outside the LBA, the proposers will be awarded proportionate shares of the 5 LIA and 2.5 LBA points depending on the percentage of total work being done by the prime consultants and subconsultants in each area. Proposers may also be awarded up to a maximum of three (3) preference points depending on the proportionate share of prime contract work to be done by LBABE and LIABE certified prime consultant(s): a. If all the prime contract work is to be performed at the prime consultant's office within the LIA, the proposer will be awarded 3 points; or b. If all the prime contract work is to be performed at the prime consultant's office within the LBA, the proposer will be awarded 1.5 points; or c. If the prime contract work is to be divided among the LIA, LBA, and outside the LBA, as in the case of a joint venture or other form of strategic alliance, the proposers will be awarded proportionate shares of the 3 LIA and 1.5 LBA points depending on the percentage of prime work being done by firms located in each area. Proposers may also be awarded up to a maximum of four (4) preference points depending on the proportionate share of work to be done by SBE and VSBE certified consultant(s) and subconsultants. a. A proportionate share of four (4) points will be awarded based on the percentage of total work to be performed by VSBE prime consultant(s) and subconsultants; or b. A proportionate share of two (2) points will be awarded based on the percentage of total work to be performed by SBE prime consultant(s) and subconsultants. Proposers may also be awarded up to a maximum of three (3) preference points for demonstrating their commitment to the Port's community values and programs. Examples of this commitment may include proposers which do the following: a. Mentor small or very small local firms; b. Commit to hiring local interns, and students; c. Participate in trade fairs or job fairs targeted to LIA businesses and job seekers; d. Participate in other activities which are dedicated to the economic development of LIA businesses, citizens, and students.

15. **Question:** Can you speak to the envisioned deliverables for the 9 adaptation strategies; would these be drawing sets for concept level?

Answer: The adaptation strategies may include drawing sets but would also include a narrative describing the problem and the proposed solution. This could come in the form of a stand-alone report or white paper.

16. **Question:** Can you provide more information on who from the Port will participate in the evaluation of submitted proposals?

Answer: The evaluation committee will be led by the Environmental Programs and Planning

(EPP) Project manager, and will include staff from maritime, aviation, and engineering.

17. **Question:** Could you provide more clarity on what is required for Item 5 (Proposed Costs)? The Proposal Worksheet only requests staff names, title, role, and hourly rate and not a detailed work breakdown structure with hours and costs for each task listed in the Scope of Service section. Can you clarify what is required?

Answer: The Port is looking for a scope of work. The scope should include the identified tasks, sub-tasks, and any necessary assumptions and limitations.

18. **Question:** How will Proposed Costs be evaluated and scored? Lowest bidder? Best value? Is the cost evaluated based on the submitted rate sheets and/or a detailed fee proposal by task?

Answer: The Port is looking for best value.

19. **Question:** For Item 3 (Client References), will the Port consider allowing for references for projects completed within a recent timeframe (for example, within the last 1 to 3 years) as opposed to a “current” client? This would allow for references who could attest to a firm’s performance on a completed project as opposed to work that is in progress.

Answer: Yes.

20. **Question:** Will the pre-bid participant list be distributed to attendees?

Answer: Yes, see attached.

21. **Question:** Are Items #7 (Litigation and Other Information) and #8 (Required Forms) required for all team members or just the prime consultant?

Answer: Litigation and Other Information is only required for the Prime contractor at this time. Should during our evaluation process, we determine we will need this information for any listed subcontractors, we will then come back to you and request that information. Please make sure your subcontractors are not debarred from doing business with the Port.

22. **Question:** Can you confirm the frequency of project meetings? Task 7 states that project meetings will be held on a **monthly** basis but the deliverable for Task 7 states that meetings will be **bi-weekly**.

Answer: In addition to the kick-off meeting, the assumption would be for weekly meetings for the first two months, followed by meetings every other week. Aside from the kick-off meeting, the vast majority of meetings would be via Zoom.

23. **Question:** Can you provide more description of the level of detail requested for the nine adaptation strategies? For example, what level of at design should the strategies be developed (e.g., conceptual, preliminary, etc.)?

Answer: The design would be conceptual. The Port is looking for a narrative as well as design.

24. **Question:** What data on the internal drainage systems will be available and what is its quality?

Answer: The drainage system of the airport is well defined and will be made available to the consultant team under contract. The maritime and CRE drainage systems are less clearly defined.

25. **Question:** What data on real estate will be available and what is its quality?

Answer: The Port has information on all of our properties, including ownership, square footage, year built, etc. This information is not, however, currently available in geospatial format.

26. **Question:** Can the Port share, for review, the tide flood vulnerability analysis for the North Field site at OAK or provide some details (what model was applied, etc.)?

Answer: It is currently in draft form and unavailable for public consumption.

27. **Question:** Regarding the utilization of a small-locally owned business, can a small local non-profit organization be certified with the Port of Oakland as a SBE or VSBE and accrue the available points for LIA or LBA? If so, can they be certified in an expedited fashion for the purposes of this RFP?

Answer: Yes. They can apply at <https://srd.portofoakland.com/>.

28. **Question:** Is there a minimum percentage of the contract value that must go to the SBE/VSBE in order to maximize the proportionately criteria?

Answer: No, best efforts are encouraged in this situation. Maximum proportionality cannot be determined until all Proposals have been submitted and evaluated against each other.

29. **Question:** What is required for the full proposed cost? Is it just the rate sheet as noted in attachment 4 or do you require additional information? What is the additional information you are needing?

Answer: The Port is looking for a scope of work. The scope should include the identified tasks, sub-tasks, and any necessary assumptions and limitations.

30. **Question:** Is the cost proposal intended to count against the 20 pages? The cost worksheet states that we can add additional pages as necessary. As there are only 7 lines for proposed staff on the form in the RFP the concern is that we have more than 7 key staff identified so, we would need to add more pages impacting the pages we will be able to have for the rest of the proposal.

Answer: The 20-page limit applies to your entire response. All other attachment/backup documentation will not count against the page limit. Since the Cost Proposal is technically a form, it will not count against the 20-page limit.

31. **Question:** Are the forms mentioned in item 8 excluded from the 20-page limit?

Answer: Yes.

32. **Question:** Is it required that we use the cost worksheet in the RFP or can we provide the fee schedule and costs in an excel format with all of the required information?

Answer: So long as you provide the required information, Excel format is acceptable. Please make sure you have provided all the requested information and you can add an additional scope if you wish.

33. **Question:** The Port is also requesting labor rates for individuals that we would not want in the body of the proposal, can we submit the cost proposal under separate cover?

Answer: Yes.

There are no other questions to RFP No. 22-23/10.



Port of Oakland
 Financial Services Division, Purchasing Department
 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA 94607

SIGN-IN SHEET

Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting

RFP No.: 22-23/10

As-Needed Consulting Services for Sea Level Rise and Groundwater Intrusion Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Plan

Date: December 1, 2022
Time: 2:30 P.M. Pacific Time
Location: Zoom Meeting/Virtual Meeting

#	Name (Print)	Company (Print)	Phone Number	Fax Number	Email (Print)
1	Daniele Spirandelli	Haley & Aldrich			dspirandelli@haleyaldrich.com
2	Dennis Shephard	Haley & Aldrich			Dshephard@haleyaldrich.com
3	Justin Vandever	AECOM			Justin.Vandever@aecom.com
4	John Lengel	RS&H			john.lengel@rsandh.com
5	Jenni Craig	Kleinfelder			jcraig@kleinfelder.com
6	Adrienne Massey-Greenidge	Port of Oakland			amassey@portoakland.com
7	Peter Leffler	Luhdorff & Scalmanini			pleffler@lsce.com
8	Joel Thompson	Stantec			joel.thompson@stantec.com
9	Cindi Douglass for Cynthia Corne	GEI Consultants			
10	Kevin Befus	U. Arkansas			kmbefus@uark.edu
11	Leanna Jensen	Integral Consulting Inc.			LJensen@integral-corp.com
12	Eric Roudebush	HydroGeoLogic Inc			roudebush@hgl.com
13	Colleen Liang	Port of Oakland			cliang@portoakland.com
14	Paul Carroll	Stantec			
15	Edwin Draper	Port of Oakland			edraper@portoakland.com



Port of Oakland
 Financial Services Division, Purchasing Department
 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA 94607

SIGN-IN SHEET

Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting

RFP No.: 22-23/10

As-Needed Consulting Services for Sea Level Rise and Groundwater Intrusion Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Plan

Date: December 1, 2022
Time: 2:30 P.M. Pacific Time
Location: Zoom Meeting/Virtual Meeting

#	Name (Print)	Company (Print)	Phone Number	Fax Number	Email (Print)
16	Cynthia Corne	GEI Consultants			ccorne@geiconsltants.com
17	Adam McClure	Motive Power			a.mcclure@motive-power.com
18	michael Cornelius	GEI Consultants			mcornelius@geiconsultants.com
19	Laura Kennedy	Woodard & Curran			lkennedy@woodardcurran.com
20	Grace Silverboard	Cal Engineering & Geology			gsilverboard@caleng.com
21	Guneet Anand	SITELAB urban studio			guneet@sitelaburbanstudio.com
22	Daniel Kuzlik	BBJ Group LLC			dkuzlik@bbjgroup.com
23	Dilip Trivedi	Moffatt & Nichol			dtrivedi@moffattnichol.com
24	Aaron Chen	Stantec			Aaron.Chen@stantec.com
25	Sam Merrill	Northgate Environmental Management			sam.merrill@ngem.com
26	Raghu Suribhatla	Haley & Aldrich			rsuribhatla@haleyaldrich
27	Paul Carroll	Stantec			paul.carroll@stantec.com
28	Peter Wijsman	Arcadis			eter.wijsman@arcadis.com
29	Tisha Renner-Cruz	AGS, Inc.			info@agsinc.com
30	David Carlson				David.Carlson@Jacobs.com



Port of Oakland
 Financial Services Division, Purchasing Department
 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA 94607

SIGN-IN SHEET

Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting

RFP No.: 22-23/10

As-Needed Consulting Services for Sea Level Rise and Groundwater Intrusion Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Plan

Date: December 1, 2022
Time: 2:30 P.M. Pacific Time
Location: Zoom Meeting/Virtual Meeting

#	Name (Print)	Company (Print)	Phone Number	Fax Number	Email (Print)
31	Scott Bodensteiner	Haley and Aldrich			sbodensteiner@haleyaldrich.com
32	Darragh Donnelly	Northgate Environmental Management			Darragh.Donnelly@ngem.com
33	Chelsea Bokman	Geosyntec Consultants			cbokman@geosyntec.com
34	Jenni Craig, Kleinfelder	Local Impact Area (LIA) Business			jcraig@kleinfelder.com
35	Nickulaus Sioson	Port of Oakland			nsioson@portoakland.com
36	Jan Novak	Port of Oakland			jnovak@portoakland.com