



ADDENDUM NO. 1

Bellingham Shipping Terminal Rail Connection

Bellingham, Washington

June 23, 2025

TO ALL PLANHOLDERS AND/OR PROSPECTIVE RESPONDENTS:

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions are hereby made a part of the Contract Documents for the Bellingham Shipping Terminal Rail Connection dated May 30, 2025, as fully and completely as if the same were fully set forth therein. Except as described below, the original Contract Documents remain unchanged:

GENERAL:

The time and date of receipt of proposals are not changed by this addendum.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

Please see **ATTACHED** document for a list of Q&A.

End of Addendum No. 1

Question 1:

can we include an 11x17 as part of the 20-page limit?

Response:

An 11 inch x17 inch page is not allowed for this submittal.

Question 2:

Please define "scope of services" for this response. Is this a conceptual / early design phase, or is the intent of this proposal to include all components through to Issued For Construction?

Response:

Please see the Scope of Work section which describes the expected scope of services. This includes gathering of data (existing plans, existing and new geotechnical data, existing and new survey), development of layout and design options, development of reports, permitting, and project design to advertisement. The Port will make a construction support service decision as advertisement approaches.

Question 3:

Could you please confirm the total estimated budget for the project? And if the project budget is inclusive of the grant, or is there additional funding available?

Response:

\$17,931,000 is the total project budget for port, consultant, and contractor efforts.

Question 4:

Will the selected engineering provider be prevented from bidding on the construction scope? If yes, please provide information on the arms length requirements for affiliated companies.?

Response: The selected engineer is prohibited from bidding on the construction scope under 2 CFR 200.319(b).

Question 5:

Please clarify the expected level of detail for the proposal schedule? Should it only include engineering, or also construction, permitting, and other phases? The current scope and 30% design information is limited, and permitting timelines are unknown as they can vary widely depending on how busy the approval groups are, so a precise schedule may be difficult to produce.?

Response:

The project is to design, bid, and build a finished project. Your proposed schedule is expected to cover all phases.

This is your firms submittal, balancing the level of detail for the schedule with other submittal elements is a decision for your team.

Question 6:

Does the Port of Bellingham have preferred vendors for the supply and construction?

Response:

No. Per Washington State law this project will be competitively bid and awarded to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

Question 7:

Is site survey included as part of the scope of services, or just overseeing the Port's preferred contractor?

Response:

Surveying the site is expected to be provided by the selected consultant team.

Question 8:

Is site geotechnical investigation included as part of the scope of services, or just overseeing the Port's preferred contractor?

Response:

Geotechnical investigation of the site is expected to be provided by the selected consultant team.

Question 9:

Is there a possibility to convert the contract to a design-build model once the design is adequately defined?

Response:

This project will remain a design-bid-build project with construction awarded to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

Question 10:

According to the schedule in the RFPS, construction completion is in December 2027. However, according to the Draft Grant Agreement provided with the RFPS, the project schedule has construction substantial completion on March 31, 2028 (page 20/105). The conflicting dates leave us confused about when the Port would like construction completed.

Response:

The Port would like the project to be completed in December 2027. The Draft Grant Agreement has substantial completion three months later to account for any unforeseen delays during design and construction.

Question 11:

What is the status of interactions with BNSF since receipt of the grant? Has the Port worked through any project concepts with them?

Response:

BNSF was consulted during the grant application phase. BNSF helped locate the connection point to the main line.

Question 12:

Is the Port considering utilizing any of the existing service track on the other side of Cornwall Avenue across from the shipping terminal entrance?

Response:

The track on the other side of Cornwall is owned and operated by BNSF. An agreement with BNSF would need to be obtained to utilize the existing service track. The Port has not started discussions with BNSF for that section of track.

Question 13:

Do you have any more information about the potential uses the project might attract?

Response:

The Port wishes to design tracks in a way that will not limit the terminal for the next generation to one particular cargo type, markets and supply chains change; autos, bagged, containers and project cargo should all be considered in the design.

Question 14:

Has there been any further discussion about where an alternative to the existing shipping terminal entrance might be located?

Response:

The Port desires a complete design for a high functioning terminal. All options for moving the terminal entrance will be considered.

Question 15:

I understand that the cover letter is part of the page limit. Can we have a cover in addition to the 20 pages?

Response:

The cover letter is part of the page limit.