



125 Central Avenue, Suite 300, Coos Bay, OR 97420

Phone: 541.267.7678 Fax: 541.269.1475

Email: portcoos@portofcoosbay.com

Project website: www.PCIPproject.com

Pacific Coast Intermodal Port (PCIP) Reedsport Grade Separation Project Addendum No. 2

Date Issued: August 12, 2026

This Addendum No. 2 is issued under §2.2 (Addenda) of the above-referenced RFP to answer Proposer Questions / Requests for Change and/or to modify the RFP. Terms used have the meanings in OAR 137-046-0110. This Addendum is incorporated into the RFP as though fully set forth therein. Except as expressly modified below, all terms and conditions of the RFP remain in full force and effect. Per §2.2, only officially issued written Addenda are binding on the Port and Proposer; the Port is not responsible for sending Addenda, and Proposers are responsible for monitoring and downloading from the posting site above.

Acknowledgment: Each Proposer must acknowledge receipt of this and all Addenda on the *Acknowledgment of Addenda* form submitted with its Proposal, consistent with the certifications in Attachment A – Proposal Cover Sheet, Part II.

RESPONSES TO PROPOSER QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS / RFI Comment No. 1

Comment: As we review the RFQ documents, we noticed that the link to Attachment C – Sample Contracts includes both a Master Services Agreement (MSA) package (MSA, Insurance Requirements, and Task Order Template) and a separate Designer Agreement Template. Could you clarify which agreement would govern consultant services if selected? If the MSA/Insurance Requirements/Task Order Template would apply, would the City be open to considering the following revisions? ■ MSA – 9 – Removed “Limits of applicable insurance policy or policies”. ○ Given the rough estimated fees associated with this project, a limitation of liability based on the full limits of our insurance policies is not reasonable. Insurance and

limitation of liability serve different purposes and should not be linked. We stand behind our work, but our fee structure does not contemplate the level of risk associated with full insurance limits. ■ MSA – 18 – Added in misuse of documents clause. This language was pulled from the Designer Agreement. o We request protection from files being used on other projects without our firm designing them based off the specific conditions of the site/project. ■ MSA Exhibit A Insurance Requirements – No Edits ■ MSA Task Order Template – Item 1 – Removed “a good and workmanlike manner” and inserted “based on the Standard of Care outlined in Section 20 of the Master Services Agreement”. o Design professionals provide a service, not a product and therefore can’t agree to good and workmanlike, however we can agree to the Standard of Care outlined in Section 20 of the MSA. Thank you.

Response: The Designer Agreement is the applicable agreement for the Reedsport Grade Separation Project scope of work.

Comment No. 2

Comment: Would the port consider allowing the org chart, and schedule to be outside of the page count similar to resumes so that we can give the Port the optimum amount of detail? Would the port also consider allowing size 10 font as it is a digital submission and would increase readability?

Response: Yes, the org chart and schedule can be included in an appendix and not count towards the proposal page limits. No, 10 point font is not an acceptable font size.

Comment No. 3

Comment: Under Section 1.7 CONTRACT TERMS & CONDITIONS, if the submitting firm/team has a current contract/MSA with the Port and/or NorthPoint; will the Port consider agreeing to the same terms if there is a slight difference from the attached RFP sample contract?

Response: The Designer Agreement is the applicable agreement for the Reedsport Grade Separation Project scope of work.

Comment No. 4

Comment: Under Section 3.2.3 EXPERIENCE, can OIPCB/Port project and personnel be used as a reference?

Response: Yes, an OIPCB/Port project or personnel can be used as a reference.

Comment No. 5

Comment: Under Section 5.2 FUTURE WORK LIMITATIONS, our firm is a professional services design and construction management firm and will be a subconsultant on this pursuit. If our team is selected, does that success preclude our firm from pursuing the other two upcoming PCIP-related projects as either a Prime or Subconsultant?

Response: It does not preclude you from pursuing other PCIP related projects as long as you did not assist in developing specifications, scope or statement of work, invitation to bid or other solicitation documents.

Comment No. 6

Comment: RFP# 2026-04RCE - PCIP Reedsport Grade Separation Project, QBS RFP for Architecture, Engineering and Related Services We reviewed your Master Services Agreement Sample and request the following changes: Item 9. Consider changing the \$1M limit to \$2M. Item 14. Consider completely deleting this item.

Response: The Master Services Agreement is not the agreement for the Reedsport Grade Separation Project scope of work. The Designer Agreement is the applicable agreement for the Reedsport Grade Separation Project scope of work.

Comment No. 7

Comment: Procurement Schedule update

Response: The RFP Submittal Closing has been revised to Wednesday, August 26, 2026, at 4 pm PST. Any changes to this RFP will be issued as official Addenda to this RFP, not later than 5 Business Days (i.e.: August 19th, 2026). The Procurement Schedule update is as follows:

<i>Procurement Schedule</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Proposal evaluation (clarification and interviews if necessary)</i>	<i>Estimated 8/27/2026 to 9/2/2026</i>
<i>Notice of Intent to Award</i>	<i>Estimated 9/3/2026</i>
<i>Negotiations*</i>	<i>Estimated 9/3/2026 to 9/9/2026</i>
<i>Contract start</i>	<i>Estimated 9/10/2026</i>

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2