



950 Fawcett Avenue, Suite 100  
Tacoma, Washington 98402  
(253) 798-7456

**ADDENDUM NO. 02 – REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NUMBER 1988**

**PARKING SURFACE LOT MANAGEMENT**

**ADDENDUM DATE: January 25, 2018**

**REVISED PROPOSAL DUE DATE: FEBRUARY 1, 2018**

Please be advised that the following change has been made on the above referenced Request for Proposal:

Proposal Due Date / Time has been extended to **February 1, 2018** to give additional time for the County to respond to vendor questions.

See attached Question and Answers issued for this RFP.

**PLEASE INDICATE YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM BY INDICATING ON THE RFP SIGNATURE PAGE**

ATTACHMENT A – QUESTIONS & ANSWERS NO. 1

# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

## PARKING SURFACE LOT MANAGEMENT

RFP No. **1988**

CONTACT: **PIERCE COUNTY PROCUREMENT & CONTRACT SERVICES**

DATE OF ISSUE QUESTION AND ANSWER: **Wednesday, January 24, 2018**

Question #	VENDOR QUESTIONS	COUNTY RESPONSES
<b>1</b>	Will Operator or County be the merchant of record for credit card transactions processed on existing equipment?	Operator
<b>2</b>	Will Operator or County be responsible for ensuring existing equipment is and remains PCI compliant?	Operator
<b>3</b>	The proposal states that Operator must ensure any equipment Operator provides is PCI compliant. Will Operator be responsible for ensuring that equipment remains PCI compliant? Which party will be the merchant of record for credit card transactions processed on equipment provided by Operator?	Operator
<b>4</b>	Will funds from credit cards transactions be directly deposited into the County's account or will the funds first settle into Operator's account?	Operator
<b>5</b>	The indemnity provision in Section 13 requires Operator to indemnify the County for all claims except to the extent occasioned by the sole negligence of County. However the following paragraph states the indemnity standard is only valid where the damages arise out of services or work in connection with construction, repair, or maintenance of a building, highway, road, etc. The parking management of the lots does not fall within any of the categories listed in the second paragraph of Section 13. So what are the Operator's indemnity obligations for the management of the parking lots under this contract?	Please consult with Operator's legal regarding this indemnity language. Any proposed changes to the County's General Provisions should be submitted with the proposal.
<b>6</b>	The RFP states the County will reimburse Operator for all expenses listed in Exhibit B, however I did not see an Exhibit B attached. Could you please provide a list of all reimbursable expenses?	Exhibit B will be a part of the resulting PSA (Personal Service Agreement) and will have an Exhibit B outlining the compensation agreement between the County and the selected operator.
<b>7</b>	Can a copy of the 2017 or 2016 audit that was done on the current parking vendor be provided?	No.
<b>8</b>	Is the 2017 total gross revenue broken down by revenue type (i.e. transient cash, transient credit card, monthly check and cash, monthly credit card) available for both the green and blue lots?	No.
<b>9</b>	Do any Pierce County departments validate for the green and blue lots?	No.
<b>10</b>	Can a document or web link be provided for Pierce County's current prevailing wage law be provided?	<a href="#">The County follows current RCW / WAC laws for all prevailing wage work. See RCW 39.12</a>

# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

## PARKING SURFACE LOT MANAGEMENT

RFP No. 1988

CONTACT: PIERCE COUNTY PROCUREMENT & CONTRACT SERVICES

DATE OF ISSUE QUESTION AND ANSWER: **Wednesday, January 24, 2018**

Question #	VENDOR QUESTIONS	COUNTY RESPONSES
11	<p>((Company)) does not usually procure individual fidelity bonds, but do maintain a master crime policy with an employee dishonesty insuring agreement. The coverage to the County would be the same. Would this be acceptable? If not, ((Company)) would charge the cost back to the location and could range between \$2,500-\$10,000 annually. Any chance we can strike the bond requirement and use the master crime policy instead?</p>	<p>An Employee Dishonesty insurance policy may satisfy the requirement. Often the term "bond" is used but in reality it is usual and customary to provide an Employee Dishonesty Insurance policy that provides coverage should an employee of the Vendor or Contractor embezzle funds or steal property. Any proposed changes to the County's General Provisions should be submitted with the proposal.</p>
12	<p>Section 14. The RFP sets maximum insurance policy deductible limits. Our deductibles are much greater than those outlined in this RFP and ours cannot be reduced. Can we strike the limitation on deductibles?</p>	<p>Any proposed changes to the County's General Provisions should be submitted with the proposal.</p>