

RFI Log – SOW #0025 – P360 Electrical Substation MCRD Parris Island

Q1. Can CAD files be distributed showing the conceptual layout, proposed duct bank location, and other GIS information as shown in sheets C100 thru C103 and E100 thru E106? The CAD file received with the solicitation only shows the sub-station existing topographic information.

A1. Drawing will be provided. All provided drawings are provided as a conceptual layout only. It is not the intention of these layouts to infer compliance with all applicable criteria or codes. Proposers are required to develop construction documents conforming with RFP requirements and applicable codes, UFC's and/or military guidance. Data contained herein shall not be used for any purpose other than as a convenience in the preparation of offeror's proposal. Any other use or reuse shall be at the sole risk of the contractor and without liability or legal exposure to the government. These representations are not construction documents. The government makes no representation regarding the accuracy or completeness. The contractor is responsible for determining if any conflict exists. Use of this representation does not relieve the contractor of duty to fully comply with the contract documents, including and without limitation, the need to check, confirm and coordinate all work.

Q2. Is the grassed parking area shown on sheet C103 to be included in this project?

A2. C103 does not indicate a grassed parking area.

Q3. Section 01 31 19.05 20, Post Award Meetings, Para. 1.3.6- Requires Level "A" Partnering. Can the design facilitator that will be conducting the Concept Design Workshop as part of the PAK Meeting also facilitate the Partnering session?

A3. Yes, provided they meet the requirements indicated in the specification. Example, the specification states "The Contractor shall provide a Facilitator who is experienced in conducting Partnering Workshops" as well as other requirements.

Q4. Section 00 35 26, Safety, Para. 1.6.1.1- requires a "dedicated" SSHO. It goes onto to state that the QCM cannot be the SSHO. Can the Superintendent fulfill the role of SSHO?

A4. No, see amendment 1.

Q5. Section 01 45 00.05 20, Quality Control, Para. 1.4.3- requires a Building Commissioning Authority. Is it your intent to require this individual on this type of project?

A5. A person responsible for commissioning electrical equipment is required. See amendment 1.

Q6. We would like to request permission to perform a field Survey of the proposed project area in order to verify grades on the Northwest side of Talasea Street around the areas of the monitoring wells and existing drainage structures from the parking areas. The purpose of the survey is to identify any challenges of routing of underground duct backs for electrical distribution as shown in Part 6, Conceptual Plan References.

A6. Additional visits to the site will not be accommodated.

Q7. Sheet E101 depicts 3 swing gates accessing the substation pad; however, the conceptual site plan does not show access to these gates. Does the government desire a graded access to these

gates? If so, what will be the design vehicle and what surface will be required - asphalt, gravel, dirt, etc.

A7. Sheet E101 shows electrical related data. See C101 for civil related data.

Q8. The Specifications indicate that the grounding grid at the new substation is to be designed and installed by the contractor. Is this correct, or will SCE&G be providing their own grounding grid? If we are to provide the grounding grid, will the contractor be responsible for bonding the substation equipment to the grounding grid or will SCE&G be responsible for bonding the substation equipment to the grounding grid?

A8. See Amendment 2. The work described in G401008 GROUNDING SYSTEMS is the responsibility of the Contractor.

Q9. The Specifications indicate that a 6" layer of protective surface, such as crushed rock, is to be installed by the contractor on top of the substation site. Is this correct, or will SCE&G be responsible for installing the rock surface to the substation site?

A9. See Amendment 2. The work described in G401008 GROUNDING SYSTEMS is the responsibility of the Contractor.

Q10. The Specifications indicate that the site lighting for the new substation is to be designed and installed by the contractor. Is this correct, or will SCE&G be providing lighting for their equipment and the contractor will only be responsible for lighting at the switchgear and outside the substation fence? If we are to provide the site lighting, are we required to use the decorative light fixtures shown in the appendix or will high pressure sodium fixtures on wood poles suffice for all required site lighting?

A10. See Amendment 1.

Q11. What communication medium are we to use for connecting the two new SF6 switchgear assemblies to the existing SCADA system: radio, fiber optic, twisted pair, or other? Is there a requirement to connect the switchgear SCADA system to any SCADA equipment inside the SCE&G substation, or are we only required to connect to the SCADA system for the base?

A11. See Amendment 2 and bid accordance with RFP. For example, see RFP Part 3 and Part 4, section G401003 and G4030.

Q12. Factor 3- Technical solution, paragraph (b), Page 12 of the Statement of Work says: "For the Conceptual Drawings, the Government will only evaluate site work, roadways, parking fire department access, *wetlands mitigation/protection*, primary electrical distribution architecture, electrical system line architecture, and telecommunication system architecture." Although we understand the need to protect surrounding wetlands and other sensitive areas, please confirm that there are no wetlands that will be need to be damaged or destroyed within the project area and that wetland permitting and/or wetland mitigation is excluded from the project scope of work.

A12. Bid in accordance with RFP. The RFP does not indicate any wetlands mitigation requirements. Concept location and grading should not require wetland mitigation. Permits include, but not necessarily limited to Land disturbance from SC OCRM and a Coastal Consistency Determination are required.

Q13. RFP PART 2- SECTION 00 31 10 METRIC MEASUREMENTS: Is it really the desire of the Government to have drawings prepared in metric? We would request that this section of RFP be deleted or revised to allow drawings and specifications to be prepared and provided in English units of measurement. Note: this requirement for metric measurements is repeated in Section 01 33 10.05 20, paragraph 1.6.7 (and possibly other locations within the RFP).

A13. Bid in accordance with RFP. SECTION 33 10.05 20, paragraph 1.6.7 states in part, "...with English Inch-pound units in brackets..." This is consistent with "Soft Metric" as defined in SECTION 00 31 10

Q14. RFP PART 2- SECTION 01 45 00.05 20 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION QUALITY CONTROL, paragraph 1.3.2 Commissioning Plan: We believe that this requirement is not applicable to this project and ask that this paragraph be deleted and that all other references to a Commissioning Plan and Commissioning Authority be removed from the statement of work/request for proposals. The specifications for commissioning are better suited for buildings and specifically for obtaining LEED certification, neither of which are applicable to the work to be completed in this project scope of work.

A14. See Amendment 1.

Q15. RFP PART 2- SECTION 01 45 00.05 20 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION QUALITY CONTROL, paragraph 1.4.3 Commissioning Authority: We believe that this requirement is not applicable to this project and ask that this paragraph be deleted and that all other references to a Commissioning Plan and Commissioning Authority be removed from the statement of work/request for proposals. The specifications for commissioning are better suited for buildings and specifically for obtaining LEED certification, neither of which are applicable to the work to be completed in this project scope of work.

A15. See Amendment 1.

Q16. RFP Part 3- Project Program, Paragraph 1: Please more clearly define the Contractor's scope of work as compared to the work that will be the responsibility of the utility company. During the site visit we were informed that the majority of the electrical work within the fenced compound would be completed by SCE&G; however, in this paragraph 1, it seems to indicate that much of the site-defined work is to be completed by the Contractor. For example: during the site visit we were informed that SCE&G would be responsible for the grounding grid, security fencing, gravel base, concrete pads for electrical equipment, etc. In the Project Description it could be construed that the Contractor is responsible for this work. Please clarify.

A16. Bid in accordance with RFP. The work inside the approximately 170' X 120' area is the responsibility of SCE&G. Work inside (grounding grid, security fencing, gravel base (above the 13' finished grade), concrete pads) are the responsibility of SCE&G. The contractor shall provide all related work outside the 170' X 120 area including site preparation to 13' grade.

Q17. A "Base Exterior Architecture Plan" is included in the RFP. Please confirm that the screen wall requirements included in this plan are not applicable to this project.

A17. Screen walls are not required.

Q18. RFP Part 3- Paragraph 2.3.1 Sustainable Design: We believe that this paragraph is not applicable for this project and ask that the paragraph be deleted.

A18. Bid in accordance with RFP.

Q19. In RFP Part 3, Paragraph 3.2 it is noted that “this substation is considered a low occupancy site and is therefore exempt from AT/FP requirements.” This statement is contradicted in RFP Part 3, Section 6, A10 FOUNDATIONS, SYSTEM DESCRIPTION, General System Requirements, wherein it is stated “all foundations shall meet the requirements of UFC 4-010-01 “DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings”. The statement is also contradicted in RFP Part 4, G20 1.4 ANTITERRORISM (AT) STANDARDS. Please confirm that this site is indeed exempt from AT/FP requirements.

A19. Site is exempt from AF/FP requirements, However, all foundations shall meet the requirements of UFC 4-010-01 “DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings. See Amendment 2.

Q20. PART 5- SECTION 31 31 16 SOIL TREATMENT FOR SUBTERRANEAN TERMITE CONTROL: We do not believe that this is applicable for this project. Can this be deleted?

A20. Bid in accordance with RFP.

Q21. RFP Part 3, section G2050 LANDSCAPING: In the site visit we were informed that landscaping would not be required, which would make this paragraph and others associated with a landscaping requirement non-applicable. Please confirm that landscaping is not included in the project scope of work.

A21. See Amendment 1.

Q22. RFP Part 3, Section G4010 ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION: Based upon information obtained during the site visit, this section seems to combine the Contractor’s scope of work with work that will be completed by SCE&G. For example, it appears that most of (or all) of paragraph G401008 GROUNDING SYSTEMS will the responsibility of SCE&G, but it is included in the Contractor’s project scope of work. Please clarify or more clearly define the Contractor’s scope of work.

A22. See Amendment 2. The work described in G401008 GROUNDING SYSTEMS is the responsibility of the Contractor.

Q23. RFP Part 6, Drawings, Sheet C103: Please confirm that the pavement shown on this sheet is to be provided by “others” and is not included in this project scope of work.

A23. C103 indicates no new pavement being part of this project.

Q24. Upon award of contract would it be possible to obtain an Autocad copy of the concept drawings and topographic survey that is included in the RFP/SOW?

A24. Topographic data (.dwg files) were provided in initial solicitation. Remainder of data (.dwg) was provided in Amendment 1.

Q25. Had a quick question as it concerns the Past Performance Questionnaires versus the CCASS Evaluation Reports. The solicitation (Factor 2 – Past Performance on page 10) states our submittal requirements as:

“For the same projects submitted under Factor 1 (Offeror Corporate Experience), provide copies of awards, customer letters of commendation, past performance questionnaires (PPQ), or customer performance evaluations. The offeror must submit this information for past performance evaluation or affirmatively state that it possesses no relevant past performance.”

I prepared a PPQ and cover sheet for a project we had performed and sent it via e-mail with a request to complete and forward to you. In their response, they requested that I use the evaluation report they had prepared at project completion and use that as their response to the PPQ. The key word in the paragraph above seems to be “or.”

My question to you is, should we send that CCASS evaluation to you as a part of our proposal response or do you require that information to come from the customer?

A25. You may submit as part of your proposal. Only Past Performance Questionnaires are required to come directly from the client.