



QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #01

RFP or RFQ / TITLE 071172 | NWSA Gateway Master Planning

CONTACT Heather Shadko, Procurement

EMAIL procurement@portoftacoma.com

PHONE NUMBER 253-428-8697

SUBMITTAL DUE DATE November 14, 2019 @2:00 PM (PST)

Q&A ISSUE DATE October 11, 2019

PROPOSER QUESTIONS	PORT RESPONSES	RFP/ RFQ Section
How will the NWSA determine which projects a firm contracted under this procurement will or will not be precluded from participating in subsequent opportunities?	The NWSA, its employees, along with other Washington Public Employers, must adhere to the requirements set forth in RCW 42.52, Ethics in Public Service. Similarly, RCW 18.43.105, WAC 196.27A-020, and WAC 468-600-030 provide guidelines for ethical behavior for Engineers and transportation professionals. The referent note in the RFQ reiterates the NWSA's responsibility to act in an ethical manner and to not knowingly create conflicts of interest or an environment where a competitive advantage may exist. The NWSA recognizes that actions prompted by its concern over conflicts of interest and its intent to create an environment where no unfair competitive advantage exists must be balanced with the needs of the NWSA and its desire promote competition and fairness in the procurement process. It is not possible to identify in a single, isolated statement all factors that may influence decisions impacting future Professional Services Agreements. Determinations will be made within the context of the work product in question at the time and the reasonably anticipated derivative works resulting from that work product. To be clear, the successful Consultant will not be automatically disqualified from participating in any subsequent procurements resulting from its work under the contract. Any subsequent procurement effort resulting from the Gateway Master Plan contract will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the Consultant to determine if a conflict or unfair competitive advantage exists. The NWSA's intent is to enhance competition, not to limit it.	
Will that determination apply to the prime consultant and all team members or just the prime consultant?	The Prime consultant firm.	

<p>The cover for the RFQ document lists a due date/time of 4 PM on November 14. Attachment A lists 2 PM instead of 4 PM. Please clarify.</p>	<p>SOQ's are due at 2:00 PM</p>	
<p>Please clarify the types of contracts covered in the preclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A Advisory services / grant support b. F easibility / site planning studies c. E ngineering design d. E nvironmental studies or statements e. C onstruction management f. O ther services: please indicate 	<p>See Q/A 1 above.</p>	
<p>Please clarify the period of time over which the preclusion would have effect, in terms of calendar and in terms of the potential timing of proposed GMP elements.</p>	<p>See Q/A 1 above.</p>	
<p>Would all members of the team selected for this work be precluded from competing for, or participating in, any subsequent contract generated by the work performed under the contract resulting from this procurement? Or would only the prime consultant be precluded?</p>		
<p>Considering the broad scope of the master planning effort and the terminals that would be considered in the master plan, it seems possible that most projects undertaken by the NWSA in the next 20 years could be related to or at least partially generated by the work performed under the contract resulting from this procurement. Is it the intent of the NWSA that the team selected for this work would be precluded from participating in subsequent contracts for capital projects that are identified, defined and prioritized in the master plan?</p>		
<p>To clarify the intent of the preclusion language, it would be helpful to have an example of a subsequent contract that the NWSA would consider to be "Primarily generated by", the work performed under the contract resulting from this procurement.</p>		