May 6, 2020

Addendum No. 1

RFQ No.: 19-20/11 – Technical Consulting Services for the Oakland Turning Basin Army Corps of Engineers Feasibility Study

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

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

1. **Question**: Referencing Page 5 of 27, Task 1, item d) – Given the uncertain nature of the specific tasks to be awarded through this contract and the likelihood of no face to face meetings for the foreseeable future associated with COVID restrictions, are the requirements for the Consultant Project Manager (CPM) to “be physically domiciled in the Northern California area” still necessary?

   **Port Response**: The Port respects and strictly adheres to Local Alameda County and State “Orders” related to COVID-19 protocols. The Port will follow all physical distancing requirements and guidelines and will expect the same of its contractors. Should the “Effective Date” of any issued contract related to this RFQ solicitation be within the period of active COVID-19 protocols, the Port will be flexible with the physical location of the selected consultant’s project manager. However, considering the multi-year duration anticipated for the scope of this RFQ, the Port anticipates that once active COVID-19 protocols cease, the selected consultant’s project manager will comply with the physical location requirement described within the RFQ solicitation.

2. **Question**: Under E, Minimum Requirements for Prime and PM it states “Five (5) or more years of experience in USACE, design, planning, and construction projects; Please clarify if this means working for the Corps projects doing design or planning or construction projects, not working at the Corp.

   **Port Response**: The five (5) or more years of experience in USACE, design, planning, and construction projects can be fulfilled exclusively or in combination as an employee or non-employee of the Corps. This includes, but is not limited to: (a) direct employment with the Corps, (b) prime-contractor relationship to the Corps, and (c) as sub-contractor to the Corps via a prime-contractor relationship.
3. **Question:** Please recommend the methods for completing Attachment 5A, Form for Calculating Preference Points without specifying which tasks will be included in the contract?

*Port Response:* While the Port of Oakland cannot recommend the methods for completing Attachment 5A for each task, we are asking you to include all subs you plan to utilize for each task included in the Request for Qualifications.

4. **Question:** Please confirm if there are any “conflicted” firms that are restricted from submitting as prime or subcontractors on this RFQ?

*Port Response:* Any and all potential or possible “Conflicts of Interest” are to be disclosed to the Port with the qualifications submission for further evaluation. Please refer to RFQ Section IV; sub subsection 8 (pg. 20 of 27) & Section VI; subsection H for further details.

5. **Question:** The RFQ instructs all responding firms (page 2 of 4) to provide hardcopies of their SOQ by the submission date. In order to avoid the need to print and deliver hardcopies during the current “Shelter in Place” order related to the COVID-19 Pandemic, will the Port authorize electronic delivery only for this submission?

*Port Response:* Submission requirements still apply as outlined in the RFP document Section VI. Additional Provisions, Section C. Deadline of Receipt of Qualification. The Port suggests that Qualifications be hand delivered to the Submittal Address to ensure their timely receipt. Because of COVID-19 it may affect delivery schedules through USPS, UPS, FedEx or other couriers so the Port highly encourages companies to send qualification proposals in early to ensure a timely delivery.

6. **Question:** If hardcopies are required, will someone be present at the delivery location to receive the SOQ package and provide proof of delivery?

*Port Response:* Yes, there will be Port staff on site to receive SOQ proposals and will provide proof of delivery if requested.

7. **Question:** Are covers and tabs considered part of the page count when calculating the 30 pages allowed for sections 1 thru 5?

*Port Response:* No, they are not part of the page count.

8. **Question:** Is it acceptable to utilize an 11x17 fold out page for the organizational chart? If not, may 8 point font be used for text?

*Port Response:* Yes, an 11” x 17” fold out (folded to an 8 ½” x 11” size) is acceptable and preferred to an 8-point font size reduction.
9. **Question:** Does the Port have a target date/time frame for the Notice-to-Proceed?

   **Port Response:** Port Staff anticipates completing the RFQ solicitation process July 2020. Negotiations for precise scope, budget, and schedule will commence after the completion of the RFQ solicitation process and will be in coordination with the USACE feasibility study schedule. Additionally, the Port Board of Commissioners will need to take action on the proposed consultant contract. A Notice-to-Proceed will follow the aforementioned steps.

10. **Question:** On page 20 of 27 of the RFQ, the Port is requesting a limit of 2 pages for the resumes, but on the April 22 call, the request was for 1 page. Please confirm which is correct?

    **Port Response:** The 2-page limit is for one-side printed pages, the 1-page limit if for a page that is printed on both sides.

11. **Question:** Since the pre-qualification conference call regarding the RFQ, has there been any further discussions with the USACE about the divisions of work between the Port and the USACE?

    **Port Response:** The Port and USACE are in regular communications and the division of work is in early development and not final as of the posting date of this Addendum No. 1.

END OF ADDENDUM NO.1