THE PORT OF LOS ANGELES
425 S. Palos Verdes Street Post Office Box 151 San Pedro, CA 90733-0151 TEL 310-SEA-PORT portoflosangeles.org

Karen Bass | *Mayor, City of Los Angeles*
Board of Harbor Commissioners: Lucille Roybal-Allard, *President*; John A. Pérez, *Vice President*; Yolanda M. De La Torre, *Commissioner*; Edward R. Renwick, *Commissioner*; I. Lee Williams, *Commissioner*
Eugene D. Seroka | *Executive Director*

DATE: May 14, 2025 (REVISED)

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR EPA CLEAN PORTS PROGRAM GRANT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES

FROM: Felicia Ansley, Contract Administrator

Pursuant to the Request for Proposals (RFP), all proposers were to submit any questions regarding this RFP by no later than April 22, 2025. Questions were to be submitted in writing, and all questions and responses were to be posted on the Harbor Department's website and www.rampla.org (RAMP ID #221518).

Below is a list of questions received from prospective proposers, and the Department's responses:

1. **Q: Did a consulting firm help the Port apply for the EPA CPP grant? If so, would it be a conflict of interest if that same consulting firm also manages the grant program?**

   A: Yes, the Harbor Department did utilize a consultant to provide as-needed assistance with the grant application. However, there is not a conflict of interest if that same consulting firm were to submit a proposal in response to this contracting opportunity. There also would not be a conflict if they were to be selected for award through this competitive procurement process.

2. **Q: Is it possible to publish the planholders list for this opportunity so that we can potentially pursue teaming?**

   A: Yes. The list of firms who have bookmarked the opportunity on the Regional Alliance Marketplace for Procurement (RAMP, www.rampla.org) is attached to the end of this Q&A document. Please note that bookmarking the opportunity on the RAMP is not a guarantee that the company intends to submit a proposal in response to the RFP.

3. **Q: Would the Harbor Department's Environmental Management Division consider costs/pricing in excess of $1 million over the 3-year period of performance given the potentially high level of effort required with maintaining grant compliance, mitigating fraud waste and abuse, and engaging stakeholders?**

A: No. The work is fully grant funded and limited to $1 million.

4. Q: [In Section 3.4.4, page 11], please clarify what is meant by "Provide a detailed equipment list for each application area with associated costs". Is this referring to equipment required to complete the project? Is this the same equipment mentioned in Cost [Section 3.4.6], "…proposed equipment, software or hardware costs"?

A: We understand that there may not be equipment/hardware/software included in your proposed solution for this project's requirements. However, if your solution does include them, we would like to know what the equipment/software/hardware is, and what the costs would be.

5. Q: [In Section 3.4.6, page 11], the Cost section requests hourly rates and a total project cost (NTE), while the Work Plan [section 3.4.4] requests staff hours and total costs associated with each task. Will you accept estimated hours for each task, as long as the total project cost (NTE) is shown in the Cost section with the hourly rates?

A: Yes.

6. Q: What are the effects of the changing environment with grants funding on the Clean Ports Program? Have any activities been re-scoped or de-scoped? Have there been any discussions with the EPA about community-centered engagement or the Harbor Community Benefits Foundation (HCBF)?

A: There have been no changes made at this time from the original EPA Clean Ports grant agreement award with the EPA.

7. Q: Will the successful proposer be considered as a [grant] sub-recipient?

A: No. The respondents to this RFP would be considered a "contractor-consultant", and not a "sub-recipient" to the grant award, per the EPA's policy: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-11/documents/gpi-16-01-subaward-policy_app-a.pdf

8. Q: How many invoices are expected to be submitted for reimbursement [to] the EPA under this award?

A: Please refer to Question 18.

9. Q: Is sub-recipient monitoring from a technical and management perspective considered in scope? If so, how many sub-recipients are being contemplated?

A: Sub-recipient monitoring is from both a technical and a management perspective. The Harbor Department will be contracting directly with 5 terminal operators and the HCBF, for a total of 6 sub-recipients. The terminals and the HCBF may subsequently subcontract with other entities in order to complete the work in their sub-recipient agreement; the selected consultant will be required to assist with monitoring that work on behalf of the Harbor Department.

10. **Q: Can you elaborate on the expected role of the consultant in terms of collaboration with terminal partners and other involved entities?**

    A: The selected consultant is expected to hold regular meetings and communicate with sub-recipients and other involved entities. Communications could include progress reporting, clarification of tasks, and ensuring EPA requirements are being met.

11. **Q: Can you provide more details on how the scoring will be weighted for each evaluation criterion listed in section 3.3?**

    A: Please refer to Exhibit E of the RFP, the "RFP Selection Evaluation Form".

12. **Q: Are there any particular stakeholder groups or community organizations that the Harbor Department prioritizes for this project?**

    A: Terminal operators and the HCBF are key project partners in the Harbor Department's Clean Ports grant project. The HCBF will be assisting the Harbor Department with community engagement on the project.

13. **Q: How often are stakeholder meetings expected to occur?**

    A: Meetings will be held on a regular basis. At the beginning of the engagement, meetings with the sub-recipients will likely be held bi-weekly but may be scaled back to monthly meetings after the individual parts of the project are underway. The HCBF will also be holding monthly outreach meetings aside from the internal project update meetings.

14. **Q: The RFP states [Section 3.2, "Proposal Submission"] that the proposal may not exceed fifteen (15) double-sided written pages. Can the Port confirm that the required forms mentioned in Section 3.4.7 can be included as an appendix and this will not count towards the 15-page limit?**

    A: Please refer to Amendment #1 of the RFP.

15. **Q: The RFP states that the proposal may not exceed fifteen (15) double-sided written pages. Since this is an electronic submission, can the Port clarify this requirement translates to 30 pages of Adobe .pdf content outside of appendices?**

    A: Please refer to Amendment #1 of the RFP.

16. **Q: The RFP outlines a comprehensive scope for grant management, including coordination, reporting, and stakeholder engagement, with $1M allocated for these contracted services over the next 3 years. Noting that the EPA permits up to 2% of the grant (approximately $8.2M) for administrative purposes (EPA FAQ, April 2024), and given the complexity of managing a grant of this magnitude, could you clarify if the Port's internal staff will handle additional critical tasks not contemplated in the scope of work – such as procurement reviews, subrecipient monitoring, or audit preparation and closeouts—to complement the RFP scope?**

A: The selected consultant will be assisting the Harbor Department's project manager with grant coordination that could include tasks not explicitly stated in the scope of work, on an as-needed basis.

17. Q: Given the Port is requesting a Time & Materials rate card and a total project cost: a) is the intent of the Port to award this contract on a T&M basis with expenses billed at actual or on a firm fixed price basis, and b) would the cost proposals be evaluated based on the lowest average rate card or [the] lowest proposed total project cost?

A: Yes, the contract will be awarded and paid on a Time & Materials basis. This RFP is for professional services, and therefore proposals will not be awarded solely based on the lowest cost; please refer to Exhibit E for the criteria that will be used by the Evaluation Committee to rate proposals.

18. Q: In order to submit a total project cost estimate, can the Port provide some data points that would help the proposers estimate the level of effort associated with grant administration, such as the expected number of monthly invoices for EPA reimbursement, the anticipated number of contracts to be reviewed, and/or the number of pieces of equipment the Port is expected to purchase?

A: We expect one monthly invoice from the selected firm providing grant management services. The number of monthly invoices expected from sub-recipients is difficult to project and is completely dependent on the terminal operator's schedule, equipment deliveries, and payments. Again, there will be 6 sub-recipients, 5 terminal operators and the HCBF.

Infrastructure reimbursement requests are expected monthly, and HCBF reimbursements are also expected on a monthly basis.

Equipment reimbursements will be partially reimbursed when purchase orders are placed, and then partially reimbursed when the equipment is delivered. The quantity of terminal equipment that will be purchased by the 5 terminal operators can be found on the Harbor Department's website link below:

https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/445628c3-5667-459a-95db-1514902f2207/sea-change-fact-sheet