

RFQQ – PNWHUB22

Question & Answers

Q. Based on review of the RFQQ, it does not indicate if the Washington Department of Commerce publish a list of potential Offerors. If a listing of potential offerors will be published, can you advise when this listing will be distributed?

A. Commerce does not send, post or share the list of potential contractors/consultants without a public records request. However, after an apparent successful bidder is announced this information does become public record, and anyone can reach out to our public disclosure office to request. Please follow the following link for more information: [Public Records Request - Washington State Department of Commerce](#)

Q. Please clarify what types of experience would meet the requirements of minimum qualification #2. Does the applicant or applicant's team have to demonstrate that it has provided support to one of the dozen or so potential organizations that are vying for the four regional hydrogen hubs being contemplated in the US? Currently there are no existing hydrogen hubs in the US, but many groups are forming teams that will compete for the DOE grants. So does Washington Department of Commerce want a company to support its efforts that is also supporting another regional hub consortium?

A. An addendum is released to change the minimum qualification for #2. This was worded incorrectly. Should read: Experience in providing comprehensive management services for a consortium including business, finance, and associated support systems.

Q. Section 4.3 states that the Qualifications Section is assigned up to a maximum of 60 points and the Quotation Section 40 points; however, Section 3.1.2 (under 1. Experience) provides points for each area of qualification – 20 points for general, 30 points for proposal development, 40 points for construction, operations, and deployment, and 10 points for additional considerations or capabilities. These total 100 points which seems inconsistent with the 60 points stated in Section 4.3. Please clarify.

A. This is correct the qualifications are scored, and if scored 100 pts., they would receive 60 overall points for the qualifications section. This is basically the breakdown of scoring to reach the full 60 for this section of staffing, experience and schedule.

Q. In Section 3.1.2 Qualifications 1. Experience, it states “* no more than 5 pages of additional information” with an asterisk by it, but we cannot identify the note for the asterisk. It is not clear what that 5-page limit applies to? Does it only include the materials asked for under the fifth bullet titled “Additional considerations or Capabilities” or does it apply to the entirety of the experience and qualifications information or some other subset?

A. The asterisk means for the additional explanation in 3.1.2.1 Qualification 1. Experience -this can only be 5 pages. This is only for item 1. Experience

Q. The only page limitation referenced is for no more than 5 pages of additional information, does that mean that the other sections – Staffing, Resumes, Schedule, Reference, OMWBE Certification, and Quotations Section are unlimited in terms of pages.

A. They are not limited, only section 3.2.1.1; however, we do ask that you limit your complete submission to only what is specifically required in the RFQQ.

Q. Section 1.2, Minimum Qualifications – Do these minimum qualifications apply to both Phase 1 and Phase 2, or just to Phase 2? It seems that the requirement for \$1B in relevant federal agency work with annual budgets of \$200M or greater would eliminate virtually all but the largest of federal contractors from applying. We see this as a key issue given that this severely limits potential for competition to very large firms / federal contractors.

A. The minimum qualifications pertain to both Phases of this RFQQ. PNWH2 and Commerce want to ensure the entity contracted with has the successful experience to manage large amounts of Federal funding.

An addendum is issued to change this minimum qualification. It now reads as this is preferred experience, and applicants who do not have this experience must justify how they will address meeting a larger scope.

That being said, if entities do not completely meet the minimum qualifications for both phases of work, we welcome submittals for Phase 1 separately from Phase 2.

Q. I understand that the budget for Phase 1 is capped at \$500k. However page 3 of 20 under the Objective header / bullet 1 states \$1-4 million for Phase 1. Could you please clarify how this amount relates to the \$500k cap mentioned elsewhere? If the project is capped at \$500k, how much would the contractor need to support individual project development for the DOE bid, versus assembly of information provided to the consultant by the multiple individual projects / teams working on the application?

A. As addendum is issued to change the total amount of the not to exceed budget for Phase 1 of the RFQQ from \$500k to \$1.5M.

Furthermore, the \$1.5M not to exceed amount is for the contractor to coordinate the development of the application for Phase 1. The \$1-4M is actually funding from DOE to support the project development activities after application submittal.

Q. Section 1.2, Minimum Qualifications -- Also the requirement for prior experience providing comprehensive management services for a H2 Hub consortium also appears to be problematic, as there has been essentially zero activity in the US until DOE's announcement of the Hydrogen hubs funding, and very minimal activity globally.

A. A. An addendum is released to change the minimum qualification for #2. This was worded incorrectly. Should read: Experience in providing comprehensive management services for a consortium including business, finance, and associated support systems.

