

SEATTLE MULTIMODAL TERMINAL AT COLMAN DOCK PROJECT
DRAFT RFFP Q&A #1
03/25/2015

Question/Comment	Date received	Response
<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>		
The draft RFFP is missing "007373 WSF – Federal Transit Administration Provisions for Construction Contracts" and "Attachments C & D" for the 005255 Agreement for Preconstruction Services. Based on the titles of these two attachments we anticipate they will be relevant to understanding the RFFP in its totality.	2/27/2015	These sections are currently in review and will be provided as part of the RFFP documents, or earlier if possible.
<u>FINAL PROPOSAL FORM</u>		
Your inclusion of a lump sum price for supplemental staff creates an inequity that may not be in the best interest of WSF. It is very difficult, given the complexity and phasing of these types of projects where the plan is yet to be developed, to price the staffing needed to properly manage the work.	3/13/2015	The RFFP will provide more specific information on the scope of services upon which to base pricing. If scope elements in the RFFP are unclear, please indicate so during the comment and question period prior to submitting your proposal; we will review any areas of ambiguity and take appropriate action.
In the early years of GC/CM in our State it was a common practice for owners to ask for lump sum pricing for all project staff. This led to contractors short changing their staff commitments and bidding accelerated schedules. The firm with the shortest schedule and smallest staff generally won the bid.	3/13/2015	We have addressed this concern by scoring Final Proposals using a straight ratio rather than tiered points, a method which might encourage this practice, and by clarifying the schedule or period of performance for both key and supplemental staff that shall be included in the Final Price Proposal
In response to that problem most public bodies have chosen to establish a schedule upon which to base the price and a specific pool of key staff to include in the specified general conditions price.	3/13/2015	Owing to the diversity of proposer teams, capabilities, and potential approaches, we are designating only specific key individuals in the key individuals pool for pricing.
In other cases, similar to what you have chosen to do with Key Individual pricing, they have asked for a monthly rate for specific staff and that has been applied to a specified schedule. In the end we believe a GC/CM best practice is to establish billing rates for all additional staff up front, with a project specific staffing plan and schedule negotiated after award. This ensures you get the people you need to appropriately provide the services you want and the job needs, while assuring competitive pricing.	3/13/2015	We believe that the best value to the taxpayers is to allow proposers to develop their own approach and pricing for key and supplemental staff needed to provide the scope of services as part of their Specified General Conditions pricing.

Page 1 of the bid form is a little disorganized. The box format on page two would make it a lot more straightforward for the bidders.	3/13/2015	We will revise the formatting of the bid form accordingly.
<u>INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS</u>		
5.1. – Accepting electronic bids is highly unusual and may be illegal. It is our understanding that the law requires that bids be submitted sealed envelopes and publically opened.	3/13/2015	We intend to revise section 5.1 to delete the electronic bid submittal option and will revise the language accordingly.
Proposal and Interview scores are typically shared in the bid room before the bids are opened.	3/13/2015	We intend to make these scores available after the final proposal deadline has passed and prior to public opening of the bids.
<u>ATTACHMENT E – MATRIX OF COST ALLOCATION</u>		
Based on what we do know we would, however, offer the following comments on the Matrix: 7.b. – Other personnel on site isn't allocated. 9.0 – CPARB reporting is generally done by the Owner, with our support. 97.0 – Dispute Review Board (DRB) costs which would not be contracted for until the construction phase should be made a NSS.	3/13/2015	We will evaluate.
The draft RFFP did not include a copy of 007200-Division 1 General Requirements for Heavy Civil General Contractor/Construction Manager Contracts. It's difficult to evaluate this matrix without exposure to this section. As this section is referenced throughout the other divisions of the draft RFFP and is the foundation to understand the Cost Allocation Matrix its content is critical to performing any meaningful review. For us to provide relevant comments we would appreciate this section of the RFFP being made available as soon as possible.	2/28/2015	These sections are currently in review and will be provided as part of the RFFP documents,