

I-5 Lid Consultant Questions

January 16, 2019

Note: Questions added since January 10, 2019 are highlighted.

Q: Can you make available to the teams a copy of the slide deck presentation of I-5 Lid analysis work that was completed by the UW Runstad Dept. of Real Estate students

A: The side deck is currently being revised. It will be posted on the OPCD web site when available.

Is there a requirement to provide an actual fee proposal as part of this initial submittal?

No.

Will all subconsultants be required to align with the City's cost-plus rate structure and FAR Part 31 pricing guidelines?

No.

Would the City be open to negotiation of a different structure with a subconsultant who does not work on a cost-plus basis?

N/A

Is there flexibility in the interview date?

If necessary, yes.

Should the Proposal Response include information on project schedule for the parts of the Scope of Work outlined in Section 5? If so, could you specify in what level of detail that information should be provided?

A Project Schedule is not a requirement.

Can you confirm that this RFP does not ask for any information regarding fees or rates for any of the consultants or subconsultants involved in the submission?

The RFP does not ask for fees or rates.

Would the project web site developed by the consultant be hosted as a page on the City of Seattle's web site?

The expectation is that the consultant will develop website-ready content that will be added to the City's existing site.

Has the Study Committee been established for the project and if so, could you provide a list of the members and their affiliations?

A Committee of key stakeholders will be established. The individual members have not yet been fully identified.

At the pre submittal meeting it was stated that an appendix could include qualifications that are unable to fit in the three pages allotted in the RFP:

Are individual team member resumes and relevant project materials (project plates) considered a part of qualifications? If so, do these additional pages go into an appendix and NOT count toward the minimum 3-page limit under Minimum Qualifications?

A: They can go in appendix, but you should be upfront in the proposal with your qualifications

In the Q&A just posted, it says:

Q: Minimum Qualifications – Is this where the city expects to see all firm description and resume-type information, including references?

A: Yes.

So, our questions are:

Is an appendix still allowed and if so, what sort of qualification information can it contain?

Yes, in can contain supportive documentation.

Will teams be docked scoring points/ranking if they include additional (succinct/targeted) qualifications in the Appendix that cannot fit within the three pages allotted for Minimum Qualifications?

Additional succinct and relevant information in the appendix will not affect ranking.

The city does not state a threshold MWBE participation goal. How will MWBE participation be scored? Is there a preferred % by the City of Seattle for MWBE inclusion goal for this project?

No targets for either for number or dollar amount. Inclusion plan criteria can be found on the website here: <http://www.seattle.gov/opcd/ongoing-initiatives/lid-i-5-feasibility-study>

If not part of the Study Committee, will members of WSDOT, SDOT, and other affected or involved City, County, and State agencies be available to the project team for discussions and review during the project?

The City of Seattle will serve as conduit to other agencies to provide input and review.

The RFP laid out 6 mandatory sections to be submitted (and now with an Appendix at the end to include relevant resumes + project sheets). Please confirm that you want the 1. Consultant Questionnaire, 2. Proof of Legal Business Name, 4. Consultant Inclusion Plan, and 6. Non-Disclosure Agreement Form to be bounded within the whole proposal response since the RFP requests the response to be submitted in a specific order.

That is correct.

Please confirm that the 10-page limit only pertains to the following section:

Mandatory – Minimum Qualifications Sheet (3-page max)

Mandatory – Proposal Response (7-page max)

Yes.

I didn't see a link to the Non-Disclosure Agreement form that is to be signed and submitted. Could you please direct us to it?

A non-disclosure agreement would only be applicable to protect trade secrets or certain private information. This would be unlikely as part of a feasibility study submittal.

Can the City and WSDOT certify that the consultant team members who complete the feasibility study for the I-5 Lid are not excluded from pursuing future contracts for the Lid I-5 Feasibility Study? Can such a certification be added to the RFP as an amendment?

Because this is only a feasibility study, consultants will not be limited in pursuing future contracts with either the City of Seattle or WSDOT. If necessary, this confirmation can be added to the final contract.

Should we include team member resumes in our proposal responses?

Allowed but not required.

If so, which section should we include them in?

Resumes can be included in an appendix.

What is the exact time the proposal response is due on Monday, January 28th?

5pm.

Can we create an Appendix to provide full team resumes and project sheet examples?

Yes, but succinct submittals are valued.

Are there specific requirements for listing references (9.4 References)?

No.

The RFP Section 8.4 calls out "Potential Inclusion Plan Disciplines". Are these synonymous with the Core team members or is the Core team as implied by the scope elements called out in the RFP (i.e. could include additional team members not on the list in 8.4)?

Must include the Core, additional team members can be included.

Can you describe the consultant's liability (its limitation) given that this is a feasibility study?

The limits of liability can be addressed in both the consultant contract and any final documents.

Can you confirm that all the materials and documents prepared by the consultant will be credited to the consultant (and consultant team) by the City when the City uses such material, including the publication of the feasibility study final report?

Typically documents and other material become property of the City of Seattle. The City does credit where appropriate.

Can some of the terms in the standard contract be negotiated such as: no waiver of consequential damages (28. K), or no personal liability (28. N)?

Not without review by the City of Seattle Law Department.

Is a fee proposal, fee breakdown, or schedule required?

No.

Is there a specific time of day for the RFP Response Deadline on January 28th?

5pm.

Will the negotiation and contract Scope of Work development occur between 2/21 and 2/28?

Yes, but additional refinement of the Scope will be an early task of the Lid Feasibility Study Committee that will assemble in March.

Should there be references for all firms? Key team members?

Just prime required, key team members at your discretion.

Is the goal of reducing or eliminating safety conflicts between vehicles, people on bikes, and people on foot, especially at I-5 entry and exit points restricted to the connections and conflicts at the entry to the ROW only or is there meant to be additional consideration given to the traffic flows on I-5 related to the entry and exit merges?

Impacts to traffic on I-5 could be relevant if modifications to existing entry and exit points are proposed but needn't be studied in depth.

Will there be direct meetings with the Freeway Park improvement team or with city or citizen stewards of the Terry Avenue Promenade, Melrose Promenade and the Pike/Pine Renaissance? If so, which?

At this time we anticipate that only City staff will meet with these organizations.

Are the pages double sided (i.e. 14 pages of data plus 6 pages or 10 pages total)?

10 pages total.

Should documentation of existing infrastructure and geotechnical conditions for this feasibility study be based on review of existing documentation or is there an expectation that additional assessments, physical surveys visual surveys, and/ or geotechnical studies be performed?

The assumption should be that be documentation will be based on exiting information.

What level of interaction with WSDOT is anticipated for possible freeway redesign?

We anticipate robust design interaction with WSDOT.

Section 4 implies some degree of freeway redesign be considered. In terms of feasibility should temporary impacts during construction and modification be considered?

Potential impacts should be identified but not necessarily resolved.

Should Section 5 impacts take into consideration the construction period as a potential project impact?

Identify the potential impact, but no need to analyze.

Consultant Questionnaire - Should each sub-consultant fill out the consultant questionnaire or just the prime consultant?

Just the prime.

Minimum Qualifications – Is this where the city expects to see all firm description and resume-type information, including references?

Yes.

Will a consultant be ineligible to compete for future I-5 Lid work if they sign on to this effort?

Participation in the study will not limit any future involvement.

What level of noise analysis would the city like to see within the feasibility study (e.g., in-depth and comprehensive – screening level and quantitative – qualitative with future requirements outlined)?

Qualitative with recommendations for future solutions/opportunities.

Would the city like both construction and traffic noise addressed?

Long term traffic noise is the main consideration here. Identifying construction noise as a potential impact should be sufficient.

Would the city like an architectural assessment of sound transmission through the lid – or should the feasibility study focus solely on environmental effects of noise (i.e., reductions in traffic noise near the lid – and an assessment of traffic noise at the ends of the lid)?

Describing noise attenuation best practice and identifying issues/considerations for future study should be adequate.

Would the traffic noise assessment need to comply with WSDOT Traffic Noise Assessment Policy – or would a screening assessment be sufficient at this stage?

Will not need detailed calculations but rather general assumptions regarding potential noise emissions.

Would a background noise survey be required?

Not for this phase.

Our general expectation is that the noise evaluation will be at a high-level and qualitative with general recommendations on best practices rather than detailed technical recommendations.

What information is available to the selected team for existing conditions (record drawings, CAD files, geotechnical borings, assessment information)?

OPCD will work with SDOT and WSDOT to provide all available documents, including as-builts, 3D base maps and survey data.

Will WSDOT provide conceptual design for "overall rehabilitation of I-5?"

As available.

What is the expected deliverable, or will the deliverable be determined during the study?

Documentation that will provide a seamless transition into the next potential phase is anticipated. The details will be determined as part of the study.

Please clarify whose references should be included (PM, Key Team members, Key Team Firms)?

Just prime/PM, key team members at your discretion.

If the submittal includes an 11x17 sheet, does that count as 2 pages?

Yes.

The RFP requires the "Consultant" to fill out the consultant questionnaire and proof of business name, etc. Are the forms and licensure requirements required of the prime firm only, or all the subconsultant firms on the team?

The Prime needs to fill out all the forms. The subconsultant need only provide proof of business name.

Do **all** sub-consultants we propose to team with need to individually include/register the following in addition to the Prime

- Register into the online business directory
- Consultant questionnaire
- Proof of legal business name
- Minimum qualifications
- Non-disclosure form

No, just proof of legal business name.

The subconsultants do not need to register since the City of Seattle will not be paying them directly.

The Prime will have to report what it has paid to the subconsultant.