

## ADDENDUM ONE

### Request for Proposal 15028 DOA #2015-0800-2758

## Bulk Fuel Storage Facilities Inventory and Assessment

August 28, 2014

FAX TO: All RFP recipients on record.

The RFP Package is hereby clarified or changed as follows:

1. The proposal deadline has been changed to 2PM, Wednesday, October 15, 2014.
2. Project Planholders list and Pre-proposal meeting sign-in sheets are attached for reference.
3. It is anticipated that another addendum will be issued mid September.

#### QUESTIONS (received to date) AND ANSWERS:

4. Q: Please clarify how many contracts AEA intends to award. It seems like the intent is for 0 to 4 to be awarded but this is not stated.

**A: The intent is to award 1 to 4 contracts.**

5. Q: The project schedule will require all travel to occur in October and November which will significantly increase costs and may decrease the accuracy and quality of data collected:
  - a. Based on past experience this period produces some of the worst weather and flying conditions seen all year. Reaching many communities will likely require multiple attempts due to cancelled flights, weather delays, etc.
  - b. Daylight hours are severely limited and temperatures can be frigid during this period (especially in the northern communities).
  - c. Early snow cover may make it difficult to see important fuel related features such as pipelines, etc.

Is there any possibility of extending the completion date to July 2015?

**A: The schedule will be updated in a future addendum.**

6. Q: Costs due to weather related travel delays are unpredictable and represent a significant financial risk. What is AEA's stance on amending the lump sum contract amount to cover additional costs incurred due to weather and/or mechanical delays? If the contractors are going to be expected to carry the full risk, costs will likely be 15% to 30% higher.

**A: Contractors will carry the risk of weather-related delays.**

7. Q: The RFP states that the project will be awarded on a lump sum cost basis. Section 6.08 provides a formula that will be used to adjust the contract amount if AEA determines that an assessment and inventory is not needed in a given community. This formula assigns equal value to all communities in a given hub area. In reality, there will be significant differences in the cost of performing assessments in different communities. For example, in the Ketchikan

hub, many of the communities are linked by the road system on POW island which will decrease the travel costs associated with each community. However, getting to Metlakatla or Port Alexander will require additional, expensive air travel costing thousands more. The proposed formula introduces significant financial risk for the proposer and will result in higher overall pricing. An alternative approach is to consider the value of each assessment on a case by case basis through negotiation with the proposer.

**A: This issue will be addressed in the next addendum.**

8. Q: Section 6.08 states that “Proposers may choose to propose on one or all of the hubs..” Section 7.06 states that “The evaluation of costs will be based on the total price to complete all tasks identified in this RFP...” Please clarify and confirm that it is acceptable for a proposer to propose on any number and/or combination of the hubs identified in the RFP.

**A: This issue will be addressed in the next addendum.**

9. Q: Section 7.06 includes a formula for converting cost proposals to points. Please confirm that the costs will be evaluated on a per hub basis, not a combined hub basis. To do this the formula would need to be modified as below

- a.  $\text{Points awarded for cost} = [(\text{Price of lowest cost proposal for hub A}) \times (\text{Maximum points for cost})] / \text{Price of each Higher Cost Proposal For Hub A}$

**A: This issue will be addressed in the next addendum.**

10. Q: Preparing a cost estimate without knowing the approximate number of tank farms in each community presents a real challenge. For some communities there may be 2 while in others there could be 10 or more.

**A: This issue will be addressed in the next addendum.**

11. Q: Minor comment – The hub names given in the body of the RFP don’t match the cost proposal form (Bethel vs. Barrow).

**A: This issue will be addressed in the next addendum.**

12. Q: The cost of adding and deleting communities is described in the RFP as something that AEA will calculate based on average community cost per hub. Can this be amended to reflect the actual change in cost by negotiation?

**A: This issue will be addressed in the next addendum.**

13. Q: Is there a contractual or other reason that this work needs to be done on such a tight schedule?

**A: A new schedule for this work will be described in the next addendum.**

14. Q: Some tank farms are much larger than others and will require more work. How will AEA address this difference in effort?

**A: Differences in level of effort between tank farms should be considered in the associated hub price in the proposal.**

15. Q: How will AEA ensure consistency between different scorers?

A: AEA will rely on the professional judgment of the contractor(s) to ensure consistency, and will respond to requests for clarification should they arise.

16. Q: What is the minimum size facility to be included in the scope?

A: The minimum EPA SPCC threshold of 1,320 gallons. The maximum facility size is the DEC C-plan facility threshold of 420,000 gallons. In addition, facilities operated by regional fuel suppliers such as Crowley and Delta Western are not included in this scope.

17. Q: Does oil stored in transformers fall within the scope of this RFP?

A: No. This RFP is limited to bulk fuel storage facilities.

18. Q: Are private bulk fuel facilities included in this scope?

A: Yes, so long as the fuel stored is used for a public purpose such as retail fuel sales or power generation.

19. Q: In section 6.06, can the Gantt chart be provided in pdf format?

A: Yes.

20. Q: Will AEA provide information it has on existing facilities such as as-built drawings, surveys, etc?

A: Yes. To the extent this information is readily available in AEA records.

21. Q: In section 5.02, paragraph 1, what is the turnaround time the contractor can expect on comments from AEA?

A: The turnaround time will be three working days or less.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.

### END OF ADDENDUM

We appreciate your participation in this solicitation.

Sincerely,

Michele Hope  
Procurement Manager  
[mhope@aidea.org](mailto:mhope@aidea.org), 907-771-3036

Attachments:  
Planholders List  
Pre-proposal sign-in sheet

<b>RFP 15028 Bulk Fuel Storage Facility Inventory &amp; Assessment</b>					
<b>Planholders List</b>					
<b>Contact Name</b>	<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Company Address</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>Fax Number</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Jeff Stanley	CRW Engineering Group, LLC	3940 Arctic Blvd., Suite 300, Anchorage, AK 99503	562-3252	561-2273	jstanley@crweng.com
Susan Mitchell	CE2 Engineers, Inc.	PO Box 232946 Anchorage, AK 99523-2946	907-349-1010	907-349-1015	s.mitchell@ce2engineers.com
Kathryn Jacobson	Hattenbury Dilley & Linnell	3335 Arctic Boulevard, Suite 100, Anchorage, AK 99503	907.564.2120	907.564.2122	kjacobson@hdlalaska.com
Dave Korpi	Great Northern Engineering	137 E Arctic, Palmer AK 99645	907-745-6988	907-745-0591	gne@mtaonline.net
Joanna Hansen	UMIAQ, LLC	6700 Arctic Spur Road, Anchorage, AK 99518	907-273-1854	907-273-1831	joanna.hansen@uicumiaq.com
Gary Case	Michael Baker jr., Inc.	3900 C Street, Anchorage, AK 99503	907-273-1600	907-273-1669	gcase@mbakerintl.com

# Pre-Proposal Sign-In Sheet

**Project:** Bulk Fuel Storage Facility Inventory & Assessment

**Project No:** 15028

**Facilitator:** Michele Hope

**Date:** 6/14/12

**Location:** Board Room

Name (please print)	Company
1. Mike Wolski	UMIAR
2. Travis Holmes	UMIAR
3. David Lockard	AEA
4. Mark Sponson	HDL
5. Ann Hulse	CRW
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
11.	
12.	
13.	
14.	
15.	