

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 292337 ADDENDUM 2

Proposal Extension:

The new due date for the proposals is 4:00 p.m., Friday, October 14, 2016.

Meeting Minutes and Questions from Walkthrough

Discussion:

Introductions were made and included MSA roles for this contract. MSA Electrical Engineering reviewed the Statement of Work (SOW) scope. It was noted that it was MSA's desire to change out the breakers and relays to increase reliability. Consolidation of some breakers to the extent possible was also desired. Electrical Engineering noted that there was a green BPA panel in the 451B facility, however upgrading that panel was not within the scope of the SOW. That noted that they would contact the BPA and discuss options for performing the work concurrently with any upgrades that might be performed. Weidert later clarified that for the purposes of the current proposal, the BPA panel should not be considered. If the need to address the panel is identified in the future, an SOW revision to add the panels to the work scope would be issued. Weidert noted that if any of the firms submitting proposals had questions after today's walk down, the questions were to be submitted to Pam Grant who is the Contract Specialist (CS) for this contract. Pam Grant would forward the questions to Weidert who will coordinate the technical responses and return the responses to Pam Grant who will distribute the questions and responses to all parties responding to the RFP.

Question: Clarification was requested on whether or not one of the options involved utility operation by a municipal entity.

Response: It was noted that Analysis Option 3.1.c addressed that scope.

Question: Seller requested clarification on availability of past studies, one-line diagrams, and control drawings.

Response: MSA noted that these documents would be made available upon request. Dana should already have electronic access. Buyer will get documents to Sellers without current electronic access

Question: How many spare breakers are there?

Response: Popp noted that there are some spare breakers but not a lot of them.

Question: Clarification was requested on whether the analyses were to address more capacity to be added to system or any infrastructure to be left in place for future occupants.

Response: Sellers were referred to last sentence in SOW, section 3.0 where new distribution lines are discussed for additional capacity.

Question: Clarification was requested on the references to both calendar days and work days in the SOW.

Response: The calendar days listed in Block 7 of the SOW Master Submittal Register (MSR) is a requirement for Sellers and includes weekends and holidays. The basis for the numbers is the needs of the Hanford End User. The Block 8 dates are Buyer work days and based upon a 4-day work week, it should be assumed that 4 work days is equivalent to 7 calendar days for a typical week.

Question: Clarification was requested regarding SOW section prohibiting Sellers from interfacing with regulatory agencies. Was this intended to cover interfacing with municipal utilities?

Response: It is not intended to prohibit interfacing with municipal utilities which will be required to complete SOW section 3.1.c. It was only intended to prohibit discussion with DOH, EPA, etc. where discussions on permitting issues have led to miscommunications in the past.

Question: How many one line diagrams are available for this scope of work?

Response: The following drawings were listed.

- a) H-4-151806, Sh1/9
- b) H-4-302795, Sh1/1
- c) H-4-302795, Sh 2/1
- d) H-4-302795, Sh 3/1
- e) H-4-302796, Sh 1/1
- f) H-4-302796, Sh 2/0
- g) H-4-302796, Sh 3/0

A commitment was made to send these drawings out with these meeting minutes.

Upon pulling up the drawings listed above in DMCS, it appears that the H-4-302795, Sh 3/1 number called out in the walk down was actually Revision 0 and that Revision 11 is the latest revision of H-4-151806, Sh 1. Additionally, two more drawings were identified that should be included in the listing:

- a) H-4-302790, Sh1/1
- b) H-4-302790, Sh2/1

(See attached drawing files)

Question: Is it possible for Sellers without electronic access to site documents to be given that access.

Response: If a Seller who does not have electronic access is the successful bidder on this task, the electronic access can be provided.

Question: Is it possible to extend the performance period as documented in the SOW MSR.

Response: The proposal needs to reflect a commitment to the schedule as defined in the SOW. If the Seller feels this is not feasible, a formal request/question along with a proposed change should be provided to the CS. If an extension is reviewed by the End User and MSA technical staff and can be accommodated, a formal response will be made and the SOW revised accordingly.

At the end of the tour, Weidert stressed some aspects that need to be provided in all proposals:

1. The proposal needs to demonstrate a commitment to the SOW schedule as defined in the MSR
2. The proposal needs to demonstrate that the vendor has the technical resources to perform the work
3. The details in the proposal need to demonstrate a clear understanding of the SOW work scope

Additional Questions

Question: Calendar days vs. work days

- The schedule currently indicates that the subcontractor deliverables will be measured by calendar days, while MSA's reviews will be measured by work days. We respectfully submit that this will cause a major scheduling discrepancy since 8 MSA review/work days equal 14 calendar days for the subcontractor. Since the project is anticipated to run through February, some of the subcontractor deliverables fall in or around the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. Is MSA willing to revise the schedule (or accept a revised schedule from the subcontractor) that measures deliverable deadlines and review timelines equally? In other words, will MSA allow subcontractor deliverables and MSA reviews to be both measured in work days?

Response: This question came up on the walk down and will be addressed in the meeting minutes as noted below.

Question: Clarification was requested on the references to both calendar days and work days in the SOW.

Response: The calendar days listed in Block 7 of the SOW Master Submittal Register (MSR) is a requirement for Sellers and includes weekends and holidays. The basis for the numbers is the needs of the Hanford End User. The Block 8 dates are Buyer work days and based upon a 4-day work week, it should be assumed that 4 work days is equivalent to 7 calendar days for a typical week.

Question: Training

- SOW Section 8.4 indicates that only periodic visits to the Hanford site will be needed, and that MSA intends for the majority of the work to be done at the subcontractor's facilities. However, SOW Section 8.1 says that subcontractor personnel will have appropriate training to access the Site including HGET and MGET. Requiring this training (and the associated time and travel expense) will only increase the budget and decrease time spent in an already-very tight schedule directly on the project; since site visits are intended to be infrequent, will MSA remove the training requirement and issue visitor badges, as needed, instead?

Response: The training listed is the minimum required for all vendor personnel performing technical work for MSA. The two courses are listed at approximately 16 hours total of Computer Based Training. The training is provided at the Vivid Learning Center on Stevens Drive. Proposal cost should cover the hours required to take this training. The actual costs of the course will be covered by MSA using a Buyer provided CACN number.

The proposed schedule was discussed during the walk down and anticipated response is noted below.

Question: Is it possible to extend the performance period as documented in the SOW MSR.

Response: The proposal needs to reflect a commitment to the schedule as defined in the SOW. If the Seller feels this is not feasible, a formal request/question along with a proposed change should be provided to the CS. If an extension is reviewed by the End User and MSA technical staff and can be accommodated, a formal response will be made and the SOW revised accordingly.