



**City of Tacoma  
Environmental Services Department – Science & Engineering**

**Jefferson & Hood Street Surface Water Interceptor Project  
Specification No. ES17-0269F**

**QUESTIONS and ANSWERS No. 1**

Short-listed firms had the opportunity to ask questions at the Pre-Proposal Meeting held November 2, 2017. The answers to the questions received and clarifications provided at the meeting are listed below and posted to the City's Project website at [www.govme.org/es/jefferson/rfp.html](http://www.govme.org/es/jefferson/rfp.html). This information IS NOT considered an addendum. Respondents should consider this information when submitting their proposals.

**Question 1: What should be included in Section 1 of the Proposal? Should it reiterate information from the SOQs?**

Answer 1: Proposers are not being asked to resubmit their qualifications, and may refer to information in their SOQ. However, the RFP identifies three additional Key Personnel: the Geotechnical Engineer, Hydrogeologist, and Soil/Groundwater Contamination Specialist; resumes for those individuals must be included in Appendix A with the Proposal unless previously provided in the SOQ. At its discretion, a Proposer may identify other individuals or firms, not described in its SOQ, that supplement its team; if it chooses to do so, the Proposer must provide resumes and firm profiles of those individuals. If there has been any change to a Proposer's team, a revised organization chart(s) must be provided. Proposers are reminded that any change in Key Personnel from those identified in Proposer's SOQ must comply with the requirements of Section 4.14 of the RFP.

**Question 2: Can you clarify the structure of fees and how they will apply to the GMP?**

Answer 2: Yes, the following description and graphic summarize the intent of the pricing approach:

**Stage 1:** For Stage 1, Proposers are asked to propose all inclusive hourly rates (including all benefits, overhead, profit, and markup by the Design-Builder) for all staff (professional services and construction) that will be providing services during Stage 1. Hourly rates are to include all taxes except sales-type taxes. Estimated not-to-exceed pricing for Stage 1 is based on the hours provided on Form 4-1, multiplied by the hourly rates from Form 4-2, plus allowances set by the City. Sales tax will be determined outside of Proposer's estimate. Not-to-exceed pricing shall be based on the draft Scope of Preliminary Services as currently written. Proposers should note that scope, hours, and billing rates will be subject to negotiations.

## Stage 1 Preliminary Services Not-to-Exceed:

<b>1. Proposer Estimate =</b>  a) Proposed Hours * Proposed Billing Rates (Form 4-2) + b) Expenses + c) Allowances (set by City)	<b>3. Stage 1 Total</b> (Sum of Boxes 1 and 2)
<b>2. Sales-type Taxes</b>	

**Stage 2:** Pricing for Stage 2 will be determined during GMP negotiations based in part on information provided in the Proposal as noted below.

- 1) The estimated Direct Design-Build Cost will be provided by the Design-Builder in its GMP proposal. The estimated Direct Design-Build Cost will include the following:
  - All estimated costs for Stage 2 professional services (design, engineering and other professional services) based on estimated hours multiplied by the hourly rates from Form 4-3, as may be modified by negotiations prior to Stage 1. The hourly rates from Form 4-3 only apply to professional services and are to include all benefits, overhead, and profit for the professional services firms. The hourly rates shall not include any overhead and profit for the Design-Builder, which will be covered by the Design-Build Fee, or general conditions, which will be covered by the General Conditions Fee. Overhead for professional services and the Design-Builder is to include all taxes, except for sales taxes.
  - All estimated costs of subcontracted construction work.
  - All estimated costs for self-perform construction based on estimated hours multiplied by the hourly rates from Form 4-4, as may be modified by negotiations prior to Stage 1. The hourly rates from Form 4-4 include salaries and benefits but are not to include overhead and profit as these will be covered by the Design-Builder Fee, or general conditions, which will be covered by the General Conditions Fee.
- 2) The General Conditions Fee will be based on the percentage proposed using Form 4-5, as may be modified by negotiations prior to Stage 1, applied to the Direct Design-Build Cost. The General Conditions Fee will be paid in lieu of specific charges for Design-Builder's supervisory and administrative labor and other general conditions-type costs as further detailed in the draft Design-Build Contract.
- 3) The Design-Build Fee will be based on the percentage proposed using Form 4-5, as may be modified by negotiations prior to Stage 1, applied to the Direct Design-Build Cost. The Design-Build Fee is intended to cover all overhead, profit, and risk.

The General Conditions Fee and Design-Build Fee will not to be applied to sales tax. If contingency is used during execution of the Project, the associated General Conditions Fee and Design-Build Fee will be funded from the contingency.

## Stage 2 GMP

<div>1. Estimated Direct Design-Build Cost =</div> <div>a) Estimated Stage 2 Professional Services (Hours * Proposed Billing Rates (Form 4-3)) + b) Estimated Subcontract costs + c) Estimated Self-Performed Construction (Hours * Proposed Billing Rates (Form 4-4))</div>	<div>4. General Conditions Fee (Proposed % * Estimated Direct DB Cost)</div>	<div>5. Design-Build Fee (Proposed % * Estimated Direct DB Cost)</div>	<div>6. GMP Total (Sum of Boxes 1-5)</div>
2. Contingency			
3. Sales-Type Taxes			

Note: Direct Design-Build Cost is equivalent to Stage 2 Design-Build Cost as used in the draft contract.

**Question 3: What sales tax rules will apply to the project? Does Rule 170 or 171 apply to each phase?**

Answer 3: For Stage 1 pricing, the Proposer's all inclusive hourly rates shall not include sales tax. Sales tax will be determined outside of the Proposer's estimate. Both Rules 170 and 171 will apply to the Direct Design-Build costs for Stage 2 storm work, as the storm main will be constructed as part of a road drainage system within the City's street Right of Way and on private property. All wastewater and water main work will be subject to Rule 170.

**Question 4: Could the City make its GIS database available?**

Answer 4: A link to the City of Tacoma's govME GIS Map has been posted on the Project website's "Home" tab. A second link has also been added for other miscellaneous City maps.

**Question 5: How does the contract address generator liability for existing soil and groundwater contamination?**

Answer 5: The City is not trying to transfer CERCLA generator risk for existing contamination to the Design-Builder. The relevant language is in Section 6.4.F of the draft Design Build Contract.

**Question 6: Will there be an opportunity to review/comment on GeoEngineers scope of work?**

Answer 6: This will depend on the timing. We are not asking Proposers to comment on GeoEngineers scope – if additional work beyond that being conducted by GeoEngineers is warranted and is not included in the draft Scope of Preliminary Services, Proposers should comment on this in their Proposal using Form C.

**Question 7: The pricing for Design-Builder geotechnical work should be based on the scope of services in Appendix 2?**

Answer: 7: Yes. If a Proposer has suggested modifications it should use Form C, but the estimated not-to-exceed price for Stage 1 work should be based on the draft Scope of Preliminary Services as written.

**Question 8: What is the status of the City's discussions with BNSF?**

Answer 8: The City made contact with BNSF over a year ago to make them aware of the project and timeframe, and to discuss the amount of time that might be required for crossing approval. BNSF representatives at that time indicated that a fairly standard perpendicular crossing could potentially be approved within about 90 days, but that a more complex crossing could take up to a year. The City has a Master Utilities License Agreement (MULA) with BNSF that includes guidelines for approvals, but the City does not know if that will help expedite the approval schedule.

**Question 9: Has any contact been made with public stakeholders? Can Proposers contact stakeholders?**

Answer 9: The City has not had a great deal of contact with stakeholders yet. Short-listed firms **shall not** contact stakeholders directly, but may route any inquiries through the City Project Contact (Kristy Beardemphl).

**Clarifications provided by City staff in Pre-Proposal Meeting:**

**Draft Contract Comments.** The City is encouraging early draft contract comments so that comments can be considered and potentially addressed in a revised draft contract. The deadline for draft contract comments is November 10, not including Appendix 2. Comments should be submitted via email to Kristy Beardemphl, City of Tacoma's Project Manager.

**Confidential Meetings.** Confidential meetings are scheduled for November 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>. Proposers should develop their agenda and send it to the City's Project Manager at least 5 days before the meeting to ensure the appropriate City representatives are in attendance. The Confidential Meetings are intended to be an open discussion on the RFP and draft Design-Build Contract.

**Stage 1 Pricing.** Stage 1 Not-to-Exceed pricing is to be based on the draft Scope of Preliminary Services as written, unless modified by addendum, and NOT on scope modifications proposed by the Proposer.

**Key Personnel.** Note that the list of Key Personnel has been expanded in the RFP (see response to Question 1).

**GeoEngineers Work.** GeoEngineers is conducting work on behalf of the City this fall and winter. Monitoring wells will be installed at all borings completed by GeoEngineers in order to collect information on seasonal high groundwater. GeoEngineers' explorations in the UWT area are intended to characterize the configuration of two aquifers in that location. As a matter of convenience, GeoEngineers will also collect geotechnical and contamination information from its boring locations. GeoEngineers will prepare a Geotechnical Data Report that

will contain the data collected. The selected Design Builder will be allowed to rely on this report.

The Design-Builder is expected to conduct additional borings and geotechnical testing, and to collect additional soil and groundwater contamination information. The intent is that soil and groundwater contamination samples (by GeoEngineers and by the selected Design-Builder) will result in data about every 100 feet along both potential alignments.

**Baseline Reports.** The Geotechnical Baseline Report is intended to set the baseline for expected geotechnical site conditions. The Contaminated Media Management Plan will set the basis for Stage 2 pricing related to the cost of managing, treating, transporting and disposing of contaminated soil and groundwater.

**Proposed Scope Modifications.** The City has described what is anticipated to be appropriate for Stage 1 geotechnical work (and all other Stage 1 work). Proposers are welcome to propose modifications using the process described in the RFP.

**Permits.** The City has set this up to complete major permits and approvals in Stage 1 so that the associated risks are eliminated or minimized. If there are costs associated with permit conditions, they can be incorporated into the GMP pricing. This seemed like the fairest way to address permitting risk for both the City and the Design-Builder. However, the City has the right to waive this requirement should conditions suggest this would be beneficial. The City will work with the selected Design-Builder on which permits could be obtained during Stage 2 and how the risks would be allocated.

**Cultural Resources.** The City is working with a consultant outside of the Design-Build contract to complete a Cultural Resources Assessment and prepare an Archaeological Resources Monitoring Plan.

**Appendices 2 and 3.** The versions of Appendices 2 and 3 issued with Volume II (Addendum 1) are identical to the versions issued with the RFP, with the exception of page numbering.